DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 188 PS 022 931

TITLE Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Hearing on Examination of Recommendations and Proposals by the Administration and Various Organizations on the Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 before the Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. United States Senate, One Hundred Third Congress, First Session (Montpelier, VT).

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities.

PUB DATE 4 Jun 93

NOTE 103p.

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Educational Attitudes; Educational Improvement; *Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; Program Improvement

IDENTIFIERS Congress 103rd; *Elementary Secondary Education Act; *Reauthorization Legislation; Vermont

ABSTRACT

These hearings transcripts present testimony concerning the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education (ESA) Act, which, since 1965, has provided the bulk of federal aid to elementary and secondary schools and related programs. Much of the testimony was from Vermont education officials, school administrators, teachers, consultants, and concerned citizens who voiced opinions about the efficacy of specific programs and activities funded by the ESA Act, particularly those items that they would like to see expanded or improved. Testimony was heard from: (1) United States Senator James M. Jeffords; (2) Vermont State Senators George B. Spaulding and Betty M. Ferraro; (3) state board of education officials; (4) state human services officials; (5) state school board officials; (6) state National Education Association officials; (7) officials of the Vermont Superintendents and Headmasters Associations; (8) officials of the Vermont Parent Teacher Association, Business Roundtable, Chamber of Commerce, and Council on Vocational-Technical Education; (9) school district superintendents and officials; (10) school principals, teachers, consultants, counselors, and librarians; (11) social service agencies; and (12) parents and concerned citizens. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PS

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 380 188

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

EXAMINATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSALS BY THE ADMINISTRATION AND VARIOUS ORGANIZATIONS ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

JUNE 4, 1993
(MONTPELIER, VT.)

PS 022931

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
HARRIS WOFFORD, Pennsylvania
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
DAN COATS, Indiana
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
DAVE DURENBERGER, Minnesota
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi

NICK LITTLEFIELD, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
SUSAN K. HATTAN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
HARRIS WOFFORD, Pennsylvania
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas
DAN COATS, Indiana
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
DAVE DURENBERGER, Minnesota

DAVID V. EVANS, *Staff Director*
PAM DEVITT, *Minority Professional Staff*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

	Page
Spaulding, Hon. George B., chair, Senate Education Committee, Montpelier, VT; Hon. Betty M. Ferraro, vice chair, Senate Education Committee, Montpelier, VT; Sally Sugarman, chair, State Board of Education, Montpellier, VT; and Ted Mable, Vermont Agency of Human Services, director of the planning division, Montpelier, VT	3
McNamara, Bob, Vermont Department of Education, School Development and Information Team, Montpelier, VT; Carlene Bellamy, Chapter 1 Coordinator for Vermont; and Mary Sherrer, chair, Chapter 2 Advisory Council	15
Burke, Marlene, president, Vermont National Education Association, Montpelier, VT; Patricia Woodward, president of the Vermont PTA; Don Jamieson, director, Vermont School Boards Association; Bill Mathis, Vermont Superintendents Association, and Tom Perry, Vermont Headmasters Association	26
Brandenberg, Maxine, president, Vermont Business Roundtable; Winton Goodrich, executive director of the Vermont Chamber of Commerce Business/Education Partnership; and Noreen O'Connor, executive director of the Vermont Council on Vocational-Technical Education	42
Willey, Jan, Addison Northeast Supervisory Union, Monkton, VT; Vicki Hornus, Burlington School District, director of special education; Susan James, Windham southeast Supervisory Union; David Switz, principal, Readsboro Elementary School; Billy Wheeler, Readsboro resident and Chapter 1 parent; and Marianne Miller, director, Central Vermont Head Start	56
Johnston, Anna, South Burlington, VT, teacher	73
McLynn, Laurie, New England Telephone, Burlington, VT	74
McIntire, Jonathan, assistant superintendent, Rutland Southwest Supervisory Union, Rutland, VT	75
Brothers, Richard, superintendent of schools, Rutland City, VT	78
McGarry, Ellie, coordinator of chapter services, Rutland City, VT	79
Billings, Susan, family services coordinator, Follow Through program, Brattleboro, VT	80
Milligan, Brenda, Brattleboro, VT	81
Chamberlain, Elizabeth, Brattleboro, VT	81
Dyer, sue, Early Education Services, Brattleboro, VT	82
Winter, Sharon, Vernon, VT	83
Gluckman, Norman, librarian at Colchester High School, Colchester, VT	84
Graves, Freddie, Fayston, VT	85
Browne, Paul, Springfield, VT	86
Weina, Louis, Church Elementary School	87
Farnum, Art, Lamoille North Supervisory Union, Montpelier, VT	88
Kolunger, Penney, elementary school counselor, South Burlington, VT	90
Murphy, Frank, director of special services, Essex Junction and Westford	91
Minkler, Debby, Chapter 1 teacher, Edmonds, Middle School, Burlington, VT	92
Sonneborn, Tom, regional consultant for the deaf and hard of hearing, Rutland, VT, and president of the Vermont Developmental Disabilities Council	93
Hersey, Frances, East Haven, VT	94
Tomlinson, Kim, resident, Vermont	95
Perry, director of planning, Vermont Department of Corrections, Montpelier, VT	96
Mahoney, Sue, coordinator of the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program at the Department of Education, Montpelier, VT	97

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

FRIDAY, JUNE 4, 1993

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Montpelier, VT.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 8:10 a.m. in the Pavilion Auditorium, Pavilion Office Building, Montpelier, VT, Senator James M. Jeffords presiding.

Present: Senator Jeffords.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JEFFORDS

Senator JEFFORDS. If you would take your seats, we will get started.

I want to thank you all for coming. This is a hearing of the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, U.S. Senate. I am the ranking Republican on this committee. This was a position that was held by Senator Stafford for many years, although he had the fortune of also being chairman of the subcommittee for a period of time during the early 1980's. The specific material which we will be discussing today is the Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which originally started in 1965. I am looking forward to hearing the testimony today from our distinguished panelists, in fact, from all Vermonters who have recommendations for the reauthorization of this important educational act. This is certainly a bill that affects us all as parents, educators and concerned citizens. I am hoping to go home tonight with some fresh ideas about how the Federal Government's role in elementary and secondary education can be improved. As you know, I have been working with these programs both in the House and in the Senate for the past 15 years, and while I believe that we have been largely successful in meeting the goals, I do believe there is always room for improvement and I expect there certainly is now as we look toward the future.

As I am sure you know, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act represents the Federal Government's largest contribution to the education of our Nation's young people. With a total nationwide funding level in 1993 of $8.6 billion, Federal spending for these 46 programs makes up nearly 6 percent of all public expenditures in the United States.

In Vermont ESEA provides over $15 Million for school based Chapter 1 programs to provide tutoring and extra instruction for disadvantaged students, over $4 Million for teacher professional development through Chapter 2 and the Eisenhower Math and Science program, and nearly $2 Million for Drug-Free Schools program to help Vermont keep schools free of drugs and violence.

ESEA programs account for approximately 4 percent of Vermont's total budget for education, which is really only a drop in the bucket, but which signifies the Federal Government's willingness and desire to be a partner with states and local communities in providing for the education of our future generations.

In my opinion, the time has come for us to dedicate further Federal resources to education. We must reorder national priorities and place the education of our young people as a top priority. We hear a lot of talk about the importance of education, and the importance of having every student go to college, and the importance of learning math and science and the importance of having computers in every classroom, but we rarely hear talk of the government putting its money where its mouth is. The fact is that we must reorder our national priorities and devote a substantially larger portion of Federal resources to education if we intend to maintain the United States' position as a world leader. At the same time, we must recognize that the primary duty and obligation of that burden and responsibility at the State level should not be interfered with with respect to the implementation of programs.

The demand for a highly skilled work force and a fully literate society is greater than ever before and is only increasing as we near the 21st Century. Global competition in our modern economy demands that we have students who can read and write on a high level, solve complex problems and continue to learn throughout their lifetimes.

President Bush and the Nation's 50 governors took a step in the right direction during an Education Summit in 1989 when they developed and adopted six challenging National Education Goals for the country to reach by the year 2000. President Clinton was one of those governors and has developed legislation to codify these six goals into law. Those goals are: One, all children in America will start school ready to learn. Two, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent. Three, all students will leave school having demonstrated competency or challenging subject matter, including English, mathematics, science, foreign language, civics and government, arts, history, and geography. And every school in the United States will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well so students may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning and productive employment in the Nation's modern economy. Four, United States students will be first in the world in math and science achievement. Five, every adult citizen will be literate and possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of leadership and citizenship. Every school in the United States will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

It is imperative that we begin to fashion our school system to help all students, all schools and all communities meet these challenging National Education Goals.

In Vermont this restructuring process has already begun. The Green Mountain Challenge and Common Core of Learning were created by teachers, parents, lawmakers, students, business people and community members to ensure that all Vermont students would reach high standards of proficiency in academic areas and gain the skills they need to be successful in college and in the workplace. The Department of Education and the Department of Human Services have joined forces with programs such as Success by Six to make sure that every Vermont child reaches school healthy and ready to learn.

The Federal Government has finally followed suit and is working to pass legislation to support the efforts that states are making to improve their systems of education. I strongly support the goals of this legislation and plan to be the primary co-sponsor of the bill. I am a primary co-sponsor of the bill Goals 2000 in the Senate.

However, Goals 2000 as to financing is small potatoes as compared with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Even if fully funded, its total appropriation would amount to only 5 percent of the annual appropriation for ESEA. If the Federal role in elementary and secondary education is really going to change, these changes must happen during this reauthorization.

At this point I will turn to the panelists and citizens to hear your recommendations about how these changes will come about to improve the education of Vermont school children, and I expect Vermont to continue to be a leader in allowing us to find the answers and solutions to the problems facing the whole country. With that, I will call our first panel to the table. On our first panel we have the Honorable George B. Spaulding the Chairman of the Senate Education Committee.

Mr. SPAULDING. Good morning, Senator.

Senator JEFFORDS. Good morning. The Honorable Betty Ferraro, Vice Chairman, Senate Education Committee. Sally Sugarman, the Chair of the State Board of Education. And Ted Mable, the Vermont Agency of Human Services, Director of the Planning Division. Thank you all for coming. I look forward to your testimony. This is an important hearing. It is the first one in the Senate on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which, as you know, is the bailiwick of our Federal effort in this regard. So I am looking forward to hearing your testimony and, Senator Spaulding, why don't you start us off.

STATEMENTS OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE B. SPAULDING, CHAIR, SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE, MONTPELIER, VT; THE HONORABLE BETTY M. FERRARO, VICE CHAIR, SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE, MONTPELIER, VT; SALLY SUGARMAN, CHAIR, STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, MONTPELIER, VT; TED MABLE, VERMONT AGENCY OF HUMAN SERVICES, DIRECTOR OF THE PLANNING DIVISION, MONTPELIER, VT;

Mr. SPAULDING. Good morning, and thank you very much for asking for my input and other Vermonters here as the folks in Washington try to draft this important piece of legislation. I am

hoping just to sort of make a few general points that maybe I am hopeful that you and your colleagues might just sort of keep in mind as you go through this. And the first one is about what—what's the question, what are we trying to do? And I hope the question is not, how can we make our schools as good as they used to be. The question should be, how can we make our schools as good as they are going to need to be out in the future. And I heard somebody recently use Wayne Gretzky as an example. And Wayne Gretzky, the great hockey player, said the reason he's great is because he knows not to go to where the puck used to be or where the puck is right now, but he's good because he has intuition as to where the puck is going to be and he gets there. And I think if we are going to be successful in education, we have to think a little bit about where the world is going to be in 10 or 20 years, and where the United States is going to be in 10 or 20 years. And if we are going to be as diverse a country as I think we probably will be, that means something for our education system. And if we are going to be the kind of global community that many people say we are going to be, that means something for our education system. And if it is true that we are moving to a decentralized world where more and more people will be working in their homes, and in Vermont and places like that, that is going to mean something for our education system as well. And I would hope just on that one that we would resist the temptation to want to centralize our education functions either at a Federal or State level because that is not the way of the future in my view of where we are going.

And with that I say what works well in San Diego probably won't in Montpelier. And I use San Diego because I know that the education department has recently hired Mr. Pazant who was their superintendent and has done a super job in San Diego, but the tendency of Montpelier, and I suspect a little bit in Washington, is to say, oh, good, there is something that works well, let's tell everybody to do it, and I don't think—that is not the way it works. What their needs and culture are in California, or Texas, or Chicago, or Florida or wherever it is is different than what we have here in Vermont. And I hope—I won't try to start crafting either some kind of programs or proposals that try to put a stamp on everybody in one model. And I have started hearing things coming out of Washington a little bit about, well, you know, we need to put some strings on here to make sure if we give them money, that they are really doing things to achieve that, or we need to have this discussion on school delivery stands or this—questions on how specific and voluntary, mandatory certain programs ought to be. And I would urge to try to realize that the needs and cultures are different in different places. And as one educator recently said, which leads to my next point, Senator, that there are two key ingredients in education; one is students that are ready and motivated to learn and the other is teachers that are ready and motivated to teach. And my real firm conviction is the best thing the Federal government could do to help education out is to address the first part of that equation. It is very simple and sound, but it is hard to do. How do we get students ready and motivated to learn? That is the first goal in the National Education Goals. And I think it is one that we know how to do that. There is plenty of evidence on what

can be done for even children coming from the most destitute economic situations and the most dysfunctional families; there are programs that work well. In my view it is a question of, in this area, resources and know how. And I would really urge that that be the highest priority, help the United States get its children ready to learn—ready and motivated to learn. And if we just did that first, I think that at the State level we could be pretty successful from there in helping our teachers with the capacity to do their job better.

Having said that, I would also hope consideration would be given to not just funding one particular model of early childhood education or child development centers. And in Vermont, Senator, when we put in place our early education program 7 or 8 years ago the thought was, should we just put more money into—put State money into Head Start programs because they are—they do an excellent job? The decision in Vermont was, no, we are going to have a bit more flexibility. Head Start programs are eligible to get our early education funds, but other community-developed models are also eligible. And I believe that as a result of that we have an absolutely superb but very limited early education system in the State. And I say limited because I don't know what it is, but less than 50 percent of the kids have access to the programs. But I think by not sort of saying, again, there is one stand that we want to follow, we know it works well so this is what we are putting all our money into, we know that is the area that we are addressing, but we allow flexibility. And I have heard, you know, just reading the papers and stuff that, well, we know Head Start works, so we are going to beef up funding for Head Start. That is fine, but I would hope there would be some flexibility for other models the states may have in place as well. Vermont is one of the few states that doesn't actually have any specific funds to supplement the Federal funds for Head Start although State early education funds do get there in the process where community groups get together and decide who is going to be providing early education to the communities. So, again, that is sort of don't tie it to one model if you could.

I thought if I only had a few key points I would be quick, so I am going to skip the next one. I hope we will keep the focus on outcome. I know that is been a big focus over the last several years, but I am starting to hear new things, delivery standards, and it starts to make me a little nervous that we are getting sidetracked from the focus on outcomes. And I hope that is not the case. And I think that ultimately what we want to know is, can the—have the students mastered certain skills, and do they know certain conceptual understandings and have certain character traits, and can they—can they have some options in life? And I would hope that we don't sort of slip back into where we were 15 years ago. It tends to be kind of circle, circle, circular, going around in circles.

More flexibility, less strings attached. Our educators in Vermont, I think I can say, are just about burned out. We've got a lot of efforts to try to reform, and improve and restructure education, and I know in Vermont we are trying not to add a whole lot of new requirements for either—either actually programmatic or paperwork requirements at this time because it is just taking time away from working with students which is ultimately what we don't want to

do. So I hope we could, as you go through this, try not to put too many strings and other bureaucratic requirements on top.

Finally, I would advocate for very clear, specific and voluntary performance standards and tests. I get worried in the process that, you know, we start with something that sounds pretty clear and understandable and by the time we get through nobody's really sure what the standards are and, you know, really whether the tests tell us any more than we really know right now. We've already got plenty of tests that kids take and virtually—Vermont, as you mentioned, we have our Green Mountain Challenge and we are getting our core curriculum. I think that national standards and perhaps a series of tests would be, on a voluntary basis, something very helpful for us, but I am—I'll say it with the Chair of the State Board sitting two down from me, I am a little nervous about our own efforts getting to the point where they are not as clear, and specific and concise as I would like to see them. And I am wondering whether they will, therefore, be as helpful as we had originally intended. So I hope that, you know, they actually achieve the goals.

And with that I conclude with saying that I personally think the National Association of Educational Progress, NAEP, deserves consideration for increased funding. I think they've done an excellent job. Vermont has tied in some of our assessment with NAEP, and instead of reinventing the wheel, maybe we ought to continue with the program that seems to have shown some progress. So I appreciate the time. Hope I didn't take too much time.

Senator JEFFORDS. That is quite all right.

Mr. SPAULDING. I appreciate having the opportunity to put in the input.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much, Jeb.

Betty.

Ms. FERRARO. I thank you also, Senator Jeffords, for this opportunity. Senator Stafford is one of my constituents, so the name is very familiar. I must stress my real concerns relevant to the integration of Federal educational programs being combined with other Federal programs. There are such stringent controls presently attached to the Chapter 1 funds either by law or regulation as well as the rigid testing system which reduces the necessary flexibility the states need. The schools already have difficulty dealing with State initiatives. We need professional development for our teachers with an optional clustering of programs, and because we are ahead in reform compared to most other states, we end up being penalized. For instance, Burlington and Rutland are the only two cities in the State with these funds and work very hard with teachers and principals to help integrate these funds and the system. We are not reaching those children who fall through the cracks with Chapter 1 funds. For instance, in Rutland we received 18 percent cut in funding which resulted in $93,000, thus, imposing a one and a half cent property tax increase.

Because Rutland and Burlington come under the Chapter 1 guidelines of receiving over 3 or $400,000, there are also unreasonable auditing requirements with endless paperwork, and this takes the educators away from education. I also feel that technical assistance for courses with a focus on major efforts of teaching children

with different intelligent levels. We need performance standards as well.

As far as Chapter 1 becoming an integral part of the school district's system reform efforts, there must, I say again, be more flexibility with these funds. Also there should be a concentration on parent training. With the early years being so very important, I believe this guidance would be extremely cost effective. Also the assessment process is already in place, thus, the testing aspect should be more relaxed, possibly outlawing testing below grade three and allow the State and school districts to make these determinations.

With regard to the Magnet School Assessment programs whereby certain schools are set up for the above-average student, I do not feel this affects Vermont as much as other states possibly because we are not large enough, have not had that much experience to really have a specific opinion. I think, for instance, Rutland received $50,000 for this program. However, in discussing this with other educators, we feel that the major objective is to make certain that any regulations tied into the Magnet Schools are flexible enough to achieve the systemic school reform.

Regarding Impact Aid programs, there should be more dollars put into this facet to really reach the children in the classroom. This track record has not been good and has really gone downhill since 1960.

In conclusion, looking back into history, our Constitution did not consider the Federal Government's place in education, heretofore, it was a local issue. Projecting ahead with the 16,000 school districts in our country, each one has different interpretations and different systems. My hope is that realistic regulations with local school district control can be adopted to address the respective needs of our children. We hear about having our students globally competitive by the year 2000, then we must focus on the future and implement a truly effective educational system.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much.

Sally.

Ms. SUGARMAN. Senator Jeffords, thank you for inviting me to testify. I want to express the State Board's appreciation of your ongoing support for education. As you know, in Vermont the efforts of the State Board and the Department of Education have been to work collaboratively with our partners in business, education and human services to change the way in which Vermont schools educate all students for life and work in the 21st Century. Our focus has been on using all our resources for systemic change. We applaud your position on Goals 2000 in maintaining the balance of responsibility between State and Federal government for education and in moving educational change forward.

The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965 can be a powerful instrument for restructuring education to meet the changing needs of the economy and the citizenry. For Vermont maintenance of a small State minimum is important because our needs are as great as those of larger communities and our resources more limited. Changing patterns of poverty throughout the Nation does not mean that Vermont has fewer poor children and families but that our percentage of the national poverty

census has fallen. This affects funding and, therefore, the services. We are serving only half the children who are eligible. We need to be sure that children in smaller rural schools in Vermont are still having their educational needs met.

Greater flexibility in rules will enable us to implement Act 230 more effectively. Reports from Vermont teachers and principals are that Act 230 with its goal of including more special needs children in regular classrooms is working. School instruction teams are not only helping teachers work with special needs populations but are changing the climates in schools. We are seeing evidence of success by Chapter 1 children in the regular classroom. Measures of success need to move beyond one standardized norm reference test to multiple measures of assessment. We need to move toward more authentic measures such as portfolios and teacher evaluations of students' performance. Although I support the categorical nature of grants, we believe there should be flexibility in using funds for school wide improvement projects which lift performance of all children in schools. We hope that all programs will work as part of an integrated system for change.

In creating school change, ongoing professional development plays a crucial role. This education needs to include paraprofessionals as well as certified teachers. Currently this is not general practice, but if it were to be supported by the Federal government, it could have a strong impact on improved practices in classrooms. In Vermont we've been making efforts to build our partnerships with parents. We need to have meaningful parental involvement as an essential part of all educational programs. Special efforts need to be made and maintained to reach parents from poverty backgrounds. Teachers have to learn the skills necessary to support these parents on behalf of their children. I listened to a moving and powerful presentation from a parent and the principal on an Even Start panel from Brattleboro. They told of the painful negotiations between them as they initially misinterpreted each other's overtures and responses. With assistance and guidance from a Human Start coordinator, they learned to understand each other and helped the child they both cared about to succeed in school. When you educate a parent, you educate a family.

Our national and State goal to have all children come to school ready to learn is facilitated by our partnership between early education in the public schools as well as between education and human services. Not only should we have Chapter 1 funded preschools in the public schools as we do in Bennington, but we must take advantage of the knowledge and techniques early educators have in working with children and families. Early intervention and prevention have proven themselves to be effective in helping low-income children learn and feel good about themselves as learners, but these programs are not panaceas and they must be followed through on educational programs at succeeding levels.

Although Stanley Pogrow writing about Chapter 1 in the May 26th Educational Week challenges many of the tenets of the educational reform movement, he does make the important point that children at different ages need different types of intervention. As we try to prevent learning problems in the early years, we need to meet the challenge of older children already in school as well as the

demands of different levels of thinking skills. Primary school age children have different educational needs than do students in fourth through eighth grade or in secondary schools. We need to develop teachers with more sophisticated knowledge and techniques to identify and assist children with different types of learning difficulties. One of the benefits of the educational restructuring movement is that it is leading to new ways of assessment, new teaching and learning strategies, new school environments and new partnerships. As we look at measurable outcomes, the Federal government can provide technical assistance to help achieve the national and State goals for high performance. Monitoring of schools needing improvement should not be punitive but supportive. Expectations for the amount of time change takes should be realistic. To evaluate programs, re-educate school personnel, and create and implement program improvement plan takes three to 5 years and I think it is important that schools be given that time. They should, of course, provide regular indicators of effectiveness and program direction.

The complexity of the educational and social challenges that Federal and State governments face is reflected in the reauthorization issues paper sent out with this invitation to testify. We need to use all of the resources available to move toward educational change. We need to collaborate with our many community and governmental partners. If we focus on the goal of educating each child so that he and she become competent, caring, productive workers, citizens and parents, we will have used our resources wisely.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you.

Ted.

Mr. MABLE. I am going to start by talking about something that you mentioned, and that is what I think about Success by Six. Specifically people don't realize that the only funding for Success by Six really has come out of the Drug-Free Schools allocation to the State of Vermont. It is a small allocation, but it is critically important to Vermont. As you know, in particular, the governor's portion is divided in terms of serving at-risk population, and a percentage of it can be served in terms of true prevention. And it is been out of that money that we've been able to fund eight pilot communities to develop the whole concept of Success by Six.

Again, many people don't realize when we say Success by Six what we really mean. It is a term given to quality home visiting, quality preschool, parent education and transitioning into kindergarten, and we have been able to utilize the funding in the Drug-Free Schools to support that initiative around the State. I think as you look at this particular act, we need to continually look at not only this money but also Chapter 1 and Head Start as their capability to be able to be flexible enough that communities want to fund the components of these programs around the State. And the reason I think this is very important not only is good socially but we've done a cost-benefit analysis. We figure that to fully implement this program in the State of Vermont, after about 5 years for which a total investment would be like in the neighborhood of $6 Million a year, but after 5 years we'd be basically ahead. Right now we estimate 28 percent of the kids arrive at the school door not ready to learn. If we could bend that curve by 10 percent, we would

be saving in the neighborhood of—I think it is about $29 Million a year from that point on, a lifetime of the child. So the point is this is a tremendous investment. Drug-Free Schools money has been a tremendous resource in Vermont to get these initiatives on board started and then hopefully we've seen this year being able to get some general fund money to replace those demonstration projects around the State.

The second aspect is focusing on the high-risk population, and there we have been able to develop three model programs to deal with what we generally call unmanageables, but these are children with very difficult emotional behavioral problems in the school and, for lack of a better term, we are calling this Success after Six. But we've used the at-risk portion to really develop models in Rutland, in Barre and Morrisville looking at particularly programs with short-term respite, counseling, substance abuse counseling, three critical component programs to intervene with these kinds of kids. Generally substance abuse is the root of the problem, to go in and work with the schools, and work with the families and addressing behavioral problem for all of the children in the schools. And as we see this unfolding, not only do we need to be getting Success by Six in place but we need to continue that support system for older kids as they move through the system or you lose what you gained in those early years. So we will be investigating in terms of how do we link those local provider social services systems into the school, link them with the school and to provide those services in the school, and we are also looking at how do you, in fact, provide those services within the school building themselves.

So very simply, the third component, what this little bit of money has done, this money has been managed. The governor spent it by what we call the Vermont Prevention Institute. The governor has turned it over to a body of people made up of commissioners—all the commissioners, deputy commissioners from the Agency of Human Services, DET, Education, Housing and Community Development and we've really taken a comprehensive look at the State of Vermont and how could we get the biggest bang for our buck by investing in critical prevention programs around the State. And we've really looked at it in terms of how you go in. And we've even gone through training of trainers, processes where we can provide facilitators to go into communities and take a comprehensive look at the issues in that community, and how can they build programs to really change some of the major social problems in that community. So in terms of recommendation, we think this particular—for Vermont this particular piece of legislation has been very successful, has provided some flexibility for us to do some things.

The only recommendation we would have is to maintain that flexibility and to join forces, if you would, with other funding forces such as Head Start, Chapter 1 and stuff like that so that we can work together in merging the funding sources for a common end for our kids in preschool as well as in the school environment.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much. A number of questions here. I left my watch. Thanks. I want to try to keep my schedule. I'll keep going all the time. I want to focus on two respects. One is what we do with the existing legislation and how to improve that, and the second is assessing what the needs are. As we look

toward the future, I feel that at this time in our history, at least for the first time in 50 years, we've had a chance to really reorder national priorities, and I am concerned that we are so budget oriented right now that we say that education is the top priority and yet our goal is to cut back on the programs this time from the budget cycle. I want to look beyond that. And you've given me a number of thoughts on where there is a need. And I know there is a great need, but when I talk about the Federal assistance, I also want to try and keep in mind the primary role of the States is to design and to develop the educational programs. The concept we are using now is one you were discussing, Ted, and that is placing kids in a position to be able to learn, and that is certainly one area that Federal Government can help. I wonder if you could tell me about the status of Vermont students as they arrive in school. How many like Even Start programs do you have working now and how many do you need to have? Has Even Start been a successful program? And if it is, should we be attempting to try and promote more of these types of programs? How many school breakfast programs do we have? How many school lunch programs do we have? How many kids are being served in that regard? And how important is that to have them well fed when they start school? Is that a problem? Give me some idea if you could on at least those areas of nutrition, getting the parents involved, the problems you are finding in replicating your Success by Six programs.

Mr. MABLE. You asked a lot of questions there. I am familiar with all the programs you are mentioning, but I think you are going to have people following me—I believe we have two Even Start programs—four? Two, and I know they are just going out for bid or that they have been rebid. So there are only two in the State. I mean—so obviously our answer's going to be we don't begin to have enough, but it is—but I think what we've got to do is look at—the critical thing I think everybody's saying is that you can't look at Even Start. We tend to look at all these programs as separate programs, and I think if we can begin to look at the capability and the funding sources of Even Start along with Chapter 1, along with the variety of funding sources and somehow integrate them in such a way that we can be able to address and put in the pieces, the program elements that really will produce a return for us, I think, is the critical comment. You mentioned the nutrition. I just was in a meeting. There is a large section that tends to be—of our schools don't have breakfast programs. Very difficult to penetrate. They tend to be, believe it or not, the poorest and the areas of greatest need. For the most part the problem is really a community decision-making process. The community sees it as a form of government intervention, all these programs have that sort of—have to address that component at a community level. The communities themselves not ready or willing to make those decisions, to accept those programs into their schools because it is the hand of government underbidding. So you have to go through a decision-making process working with the community and helping that community decide what they want that school to be, and what do they want happening and encourage in supporting that community in terms of building the critical program elements that fit into that community.

Ms. SUGARMAN. I think that one of the messages that we are all saying is the importance of both flexibility and allowing communities to use their resources most effectively but also an integration of the different kinds of services. And when you talk about school lunches and school breakfasts, I can't give you exact figures, but I do know we had a presentation from a nutritionist talking about the problem in the State of Vermont during the summertime when school was closed and there were children who were not getting breakfast or lunch, and this is what they need. I think those are the kinds of things that we need to address both in the ways in which we organize our resources but just having enough resources to see that children aren't going hungry because they are not in school during the summer.

Mr. MABLE. One specific idea that Bob McNamara and I were talking about is looking at Chapter 1 as being able—and I don't know, but I think that is the question, having that funding source being able to fund transition programming into kindergarten, to be able to sit down at age three and four with the family, having the school be able to sit down, and assessing the total family needs and that child's needs of being able to plan to facilitate whether it is how do you get on the bus, all the problems you are concerned about your child after they enter school to be able—we are looking—there is very little transition. Other than EEE, there is almost no transition planning going on and it is a critical component in terms of, one, being able to assess the social and health care needs of the child, the family needs, the issues that you need to do to support the family. That all needs to take place if that child's going to be successful in school. And so a weak—there is right now no funding source to put that critical program component in, and I think Chapter 1 could easily be a funding source for that major piece. I think the other end of it is, is that not only what can we do to have kids be ready for school, we have to really define what is it that a school needs to do to be ready for kids. As you talk to a lot of kindergarten teachers, they feel tremendous pressure. They feel kids are arriving without the social and developmental skills of being able to share, to play together and stuff like that, and yet they feel pressure by first grade teachers and that sort of thing to teach the alphabet, can they print their name and that sort of thing. And so we—so I think schools need to look at what does it mean to be ready for kids so that there is an environment so that all children can be successful at an early age.

Ms. FERRARO. Also with reference to children being ready, I think this goes back to the need for parents being trained as far as creating a good image of self so the child can have good self-esteem to start out with, and many parents aren't equipped to do this in many schools. But also another issue that I am sure you are aware of, I don't know how many others are, is the integration that is trying to take place right now with the three collaboratives that have been established in this State, the Rutland collaborative, the Bennington collaborative and the Connecticut River collaborative, and these are groups within these areas that are setting up and coordinating expertise. And there was a terrific example of that just a couple of months ago in Mill River School in Rutland. They had several students that were excelling in math beyond what the

grade level provided, but there was a teacher in Ludlow that qualified for this, and so through the exchange there is an integration process starting. And I don't know if funds would be available under this program for these collaboratives, but it is really exciting.

Senator JEFFORDS. Jeb.

Mr. SPAULDING. Well, I don't have much to add other than if it is a time that we have a chance to rethink our priorities on a national level, hopefully education would come to the top. It is also a transitional time on—for education itself. This is back to our—I think where I started. It is a pretty generally hard to communicate concept, but what the needs of this country were and have been up until fairly recent times are going to be different than they are going to be 10 or 20 years down the road. And we are moving away from the industrial society, as we all know, the technological, global world. And as we rethink our priorities of where education fits, I hope we also rethink a little bit what the role and kind of delivery system we are going to have for education and the future is so that we don't just raise it up, and ratchet it up and use the same model or models that we've been using only doing it with a vengeance; that we rethink the entire process a little bit.

Senator JEFFORDS. I agree. I think that is why I am raising these questions. It is kind of a dilemma. Financing is key to a lot of it. Now we run programs—demonstration programs and you say they are wonderful. If they are wonderful, then they should be replicated. If they are going to be replicated, who's going to pay for them? Then you have the lack of resources at the local level, the higher property taxes, the people turning down proposal after proposal to increase funding, the State trying to think in terms of how they are going to increase the funding, and that is not an easy chore either. Of course, we are in a budget crunch right now, but it seems to me that we've got to face up to the fact that nationally it is important. And the courts, as demonstrated in the Texas case, are demanding that there be better services in education. Back in the 1970's we had the same problem in California which led to revenue sharing, which then got thrown out. It appeared to be being used for everything except education. And I was against doing away with it. I thought it should be oriented just to education, but the Federal role becomes complicated in the sense that we develop specific programs to take care of specific groups and then you demand for flexibility so that you can use that money the way you see best fit. We have a problem if we use Chapter 1 funds which are supposed to be going toward the economically disadvantaged, for expenditures aren't going toward those that are economically disadvantaged. How can we justify flexibility in this case? And it is the same with Special Ed and all of these programs. Although we don't have time enough this morning to solve all those while you are here, I hope you can keep the dialogue open as we move toward the future and decide whether our whole efforts in the Federal area should be just focused on increasing the funding for existing programs, or whether it should be a general revenue-sharing approach or what it should be. I am sure the states will all say, just give us the money, we will do a better job than you guys. And that may well be true in Vermont, but it is not necessarily true in Mississippi or other areas that have different kinds of problems.

Mr. MABLE. I just want to respond. You have the State problem at the State level. I just have one thought because I understand what you are saying. If you broaden or weaken the intent of the legislation so much it loses identity and the support, and then the stronger you make that piece of legislation, the greater the cries you get locally in terms of being too restrictive. And we sent—we tend to think—to get caught in this debate on either end. And I think there is another alternative, quite frankly, and that is somewhere in the middle. I think you can maintain the integrity of the Chapter 1 program and the other programs and provide within that some flexibility by having a community or in your case a State say, OK, you submit a plan to us about how you are going to spend this money maintaining the integrity—you would write in all the insurances that you need to see to maintain that integrity, but allow us to integrate some of the funding and ensuring that each of those dollars are being protected. By that they are being molded together to address a particular State or community need. So all I am saying is that don't—I don't think we often lock ourselves in one or two extremes. I think there is really a middle road, and I think there has to be that middle road for you to be able to lobby for the money at your level and for you to feel secure that it is getting to the kids it is intended to.

Senator JEFFORDS. Then, of course, we get into the problem of school governance—not much in Vermont but in other States—about who has the final say—the State or the LEA. It is not a problem in Vermont, but I tell you when you get into debates about whether New York City or the State of New York has the final say about a plan, then you have a problem. If everybody submits a plan, then you are going to have a huge number of plans for the Secretary to review beyond those developed on the State level. So it is not that easy. I guess we've kind of talked about what you were talking Betty, about the difficulties of auditing and the required paperwork of Chapter 1. We understand that, but these are problems that we are going to have to try and find better solutions to. Well, I am not sure we solved all the problems.

Mr. SPAULDING. Could I ask just one brief question?

Senator JEFFORDS. Sure.

Mr. SPAULDING. I have read in the papers and stuff like that that there is some thought about having some kind of Federal requirements to make progress in the area of financial equity in order to continue qualifying for funds or something's going to happen. Is that a real possibility?

Senator JEFFORDS. Well, anything's a real possibility right now. I wouldn't want to gloss it over and say, don't worry about it, because you have the courts beginning to move into this—as we've seen in Texas and I am sure you'll see in other areas, where the court feels there is an inappropriate allocation of resources, either broadly or to certain areas. Hopefully these cases will generate an effort on all parts to try and increase the financial funding in order to handle some of these problems. Vermont fortunately, I think, is ahead in the sense of trying to bring about solutions, but also they are behind in some respects in the amount of money that we dedicate to education. So it is a tough problem.

Mr. SPAULDING. Well, what I was going to say was that I hope we think long and hard about doing that at the Federal level because my understanding is now they are—I'll just pick a number, there are 25 court cases at the State level and I think that we are going to—we have severe equity problems in the State of Vermont. We are working on it, but I think that the States themselves, the court system is not just one or two, it is half the States, there is lawsuits going on and I think it will probably take care of itself. And I hate to see some new sort of requirements and restrictions to prove that you are making a certain amount of progress which will take more paperwork, and bookkeeping and stuff to go through. And when I read it, I just wanted to take the opportunity to let one of my Senators know that I think the states will probably take care of that problem on their own in the next few years. Give us a chance.

Senator JEFFORDS. I'll relax. I won't worry anymore. It is a tough national problem and hopefully we will find some answers to it, but as I said earlier, when you take a look—if this is a national priority and you realize that out of our $1.6 Trillion budget we spend 2 percent on education in this country, you can't help but wonder if it is one of the top, if not the top, problem in this country faced for the future to place us in a position to be competitive and to see an increasing standard of living instead of a decreasing standard of living as to whether or not we ought to spend more than 2 percent of our Federal budget on education. But if we do, how many strings do you tie to it and what does that do. But I personally have dedicated to the proposition that if it is that important an issue, we ought to look at the Federal Government in trying to reorder its priorities to spend more than 2 percent. So what I am trying to figure out is what it would take to do everything we wanted. We have all these wonderful programs that we start off as demonstrations and we find out that they are successful, and then we forget about them or we don't replicate them. And then we have these two wonderful little programs working and a small number of young people get the advantages of them, but we don't have any money to replicate them. Thank you all. Pleasure. Thank you. Excellent testimony.

Our next panel is Bob McNamara, Vermont Department of Education, School Development and Information Team; and Carlene Bellamy, the Chapter 1 Coordinator for the State; and Mary Sherrer, Chair, Chapter 2, Advisory Council. So if you would please come forward and be seated. Carlene, why don't you go right ahead. Whoever wants to start is fine.

STATEMENT OF BOB MCNAMARA, VERMONT DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT AND INFORMATION TEAM, MONTPELIER, VT; CARLENE BELLAMY, CHAPTER 1 COORDINATOR FOR VT; AND MARY SHERRER, CHAIR, CHAPTER 2 ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr. MCNAMARA. I think I am going to start. We switched the order on you, I am sorry, Senator. Thanks for having us here. I am here on Rick Mill's behalf. Rick couldn't be here, as you know, but he wanted to make sure—and you know him well enough to know that he made sure that I would make sure to tell you that he wants

to work really actively with you throughout the whole reauthorization and appreciates everything you've already done with it.

Senator JEFFORDS. Just interject that he did an excellent job. I made sure he got his chance in Washington to tell the rest of the country what ought to be done, and he did an excellent job of that, explaining what Vermont is doing. And so I told him that if he was going to be there, that was fine; I would get the chance to talk and listen to him there, but pleased to have you here today and I understand why he can't be here.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Thanks. Another thing I want to make sure I do is to get a chance just to introduce some people who are here who aren't going to be speaking but who are responsible for coordinating these programs at the State level, and they are really key people. Sue Mahoney, and I am going to say that. Sue here? Sue does the Drug-Free Schools program. And Lynn Provasi. Lynn, stand right up. And Lynn does Chapter 2. And Mitzi Beach. Did Mitzi step out? She's been here all along, and she'll be back, I am sure. Mitzi does Chapter 1. They are really the key people for us in the programs. And there are other folks who do key jobs, but they are not here right this morning but have provided some input and some feedback.

I think what I want to be able to say is just a few things. First of all, I handed in some written testimony, and that goes into more detail, but I want to just pick off a few points. One is that the kind of change I think we need to have is significant and dramatic and not just fixing around the edges. And that the problems in our system today are systemic and we've gone through—well, name the blame. You know, we've blamed parents for not raising their kids right, we've blamed State departments for being overly bureaucratic, we've blamed the Congress for not providing adequate funding and so on and so forth. And I think what we have to recognize is that unless we work together, this is not going to happen and we are not going to get the results that we need. And that really means that we need to define roles, and responsibilities and so on and so forth. So let me hit a couple of points. Let's get rid of norm reference to achievement testing for Chapter 1 and just take care of it. It really—there are alternative ways. For national accountability there are some good studies that have already gone on, and I think that we support the recommendations of the studies that have gone on that you can—for Federal accountability you can figure out some larger based ways to do samples and so on and so forth to get results, but let the State and local design the accountability systems that they need. I am not suggesting not to be accountable; I am suggesting we need different ones. And I don't know who it was earlier said Texas needs different ones, and Vermont needs different ones, and Georgia, and so on and so forth.

I just put out a guide for professional development, and what I had to do—it is like a crib sheet on how to figure out all the Federal programs, when the funding cycles come, what the requirements are, who you have to talk to. I really would like to get to the point of where we don't need a guide, and what I would suggest is a single system in ESEA for granting cycles, and for reporting cycles and for all the mechanisms so that when people try to work these things together in systemic, integrated ways, that practically

they can do it. Right now we have pockets. The Eisenhower stuff, you might have a seventh and eighth grade teacher doing that. Chapter 2 might have an assistant principal, an assistant superintendent. Chapter 1, you've got the Chapter 1 coordinator. And we are small, but it is ironic that even though we are small those things can work to fracture the system rather than to make things come together.

The other thing I would suggest is that Chapter 2, as you know, has been going down by bits and pieces. It is like taking a little bit on the edges each year in terms of the authorizations. I think it needs an identity. I really think that something—what happened in the—Chapter 2 needs an identity. And the reauthorization in 1980, I think it was when it went to all block grants, I really think that the constituency groups didn't know what to line up behind. I think it is been struggling with that, and I would really suggest that that identity needs to be around systemic reform and to really perfect other resources and incentives to make sure that those funds are used most effectively, but to give it an identity because I think without an identity, I think it is not going to go anyplace.

I think we really need to look at supplements, supplant provisions and to make sure that it really allows the flexibility but at the same time the accountability. I am not at all proposing that we not target resources for specific purposes. I think we need to. I think the notion of just dropping Edgar May—Senator May of Vermont used to have a notion he called stump money, and stump money was—what happened, you left the money on a stump overnight, you went home, you came back and it was gone. And you never quite know—he used to worry that Special Ed money was stump money. And he questioned us, how do we know it is working. I don't want stump money. I don't think we can afford to do that, but I do think what has to happen in the translation—I don't think it is easy, I don't envy your job at the Federal level—to try to figure out how do you provide opportunities so that when a school has a plan and the plan is really based on its needs and the needs of the students in that community, that these resources don't run separate programs in boxes but what they run is the resources to support that plan and that they do benefit the target groups?

Maintain and expand any Federal competitive funds you can do in the area of school reform. Vermont has a wonderful track record because we are trying to get out in front. We are trying to do the best that we can do, and in that regard we are trying to work on systemic reform, and we've been very fortunate to benefit from some of these programs. I think that they allow people to go out there and take risks without having to guide a whole $8 Billion worth on them. So that in some ways they are the front runners to try to learn from. We just recently found out—for instance, National Science Foundation, the systemic ESSIs, and we just found out we received a fairly significant first grant to write curriculum frameworks for the State.

To build on the common core. Another aspect that really has to be dealt with is this issue about how do you build partnerships to support education, and I think the Federal government does have to be a partner in this. I don't think it is the partner; I think we need to get away from the mentality that the role of the Federal

government is kind of like search and seize. You know, you go in and try to find something wrong, that that is what the relationship is. I really think it has to change into one of a partner that has roles and responsibilities and that the primary goal and aim is to support one another to get to the end and to have a single focus. One of the things that we always work on is to say, you know, we've got to make sure that basically we have a sense of vision, and we are working together and that we are all going, you know, north, if you will. Now some people are going to go northeast and some people are going to go northwest, but the real concern is we really don't want anybody going south. And I think that in this regard really that would be the test, is to make sure there are the national goals.

Vermont goals. They align quite nicely. I think ours even go beyond, as they should, to start to define some things that happen within our educational system but—and that helps, but all these programs need to be construed or envisioned in a way that are moving in the same direction. I think some of the work around the Goals 2000 as a structure and a framework is really a great start. It is a very different way to start to perceive how does the Federal Government interact with the State government. It is a great way to start the discussion on what that role and relationship should be.

Other issues around partnerships. Ted Mable spoke quite nicely to the idea of transitioning and other—you know, flexibility so that Chapter 1 could work as a key component. The one piece that I just suggest is—and I was thinking last night on what I would say, I don't understand a lot of the Federal programs—other Federal programs that don't come through education. For instance, Head Start, I just don't get it. And it is not because I am naive to it, but it is constructed differently, it is configured differently, the sources of funds come in different directions. There aren't the regular communications that happen with other programs. Anything that can be done—it is not an ESEA issue, but anything that can be done to keep those lines of communication open but—and I don't mean in a bureaucratic expense, I don't mean being on some of these mailings, but part of the discussion when these people sit down at the table to talk about how are we going to move forward to meet these national goals because we need to meet them all. We can't just be successful in meeting number one. So that Head Start actually is a partner in an investment to meet all six the way that I look at it. And that really what we need to do is to be at the table talking through how are we working in that sort of partnership. I am not saying this to be critical of Head Start because I don't know if you know what I mean; I am saying it to say that I need some more support and guidance on specifically how can we interface with them, how can we be at the table, how can they be at the table? We make a lot of decisions around early education in the same regard. It is a two-way street, that sort of thing.

I think another aspect we have to pay attention to if we are going to work systemic is we have to take a look at issues around financing governs as Senator Spaulding said. There is been a lot of work in Vermont to work on those issues. Those are tough. How should we be governing ourselves and structured to govern and

how should we be financing education. But I wanted to point out to you that—and I alluded to it earlier, we have a number of grants. I had just started listing, and I am not going to read the laundry list, but we have seven or eight that we are currently operating under right now for systemic reform. We are reforming the State system on soft money and we—and that is okay to start, but what we need to do is to really make sure that the soft money doesn't go away. You used the example about you've got this kind of neat program, it works, now what do you do with it, that sort of thing. And the clock's running for us, and we need to make sure that Chapter 1, ESEA, the whole package, is really focused and aligned around systemic reform because that will be part of the hard money that can package in to being able to continue the work that we are trying to do.

I am going to say my mandatory things, and I say that because I say this every time, and it is mandatory because it is critical and essential. We absolutely need the small State minimum. And I know you know that, and I know you've gone to the wall for that, and I know you've probably got a few bruises you could share on that because I know the tone and temperament isn't all in that direction. For us, you know, all these discussions around how do you concentrate resources and so on are discussions that are really things that we can't relate to. We are in a situation where the northeast looked a lot—our economy fell apart after the census person came if you know what I mean. You know, they kind of came and then we had no more money left after that. And so that it really is a serious issue and I—I have thought long and hard about how do you deal with it because people always ask me the $64 questions about what if we concentrate poverty at X place, what if we did school-wide projects at Y point. I can't figure out any other way except to say in our circumstance we've got to maintain a core or base of funding to work from, otherwise, it will be like a yo-yo.

Prior to small State funding we literally went through years where—I came into the State government, I don't know, about nine or 10 years ago. They told me it was going to be an easy job in Chapter 1, and that never turned out to be true. It is been a great job when I did Chapter 1 directing, but literally some years we were down 10 to 12 percent on a state-wide average. Other years we were up 22 percent. What that creates is a situation where local people don't trust. And it is kind of like the Federal road projects, here today, gone tomorrow. What's going to happen? Is there going to be an exit and then it is just an exit to nowhere, you know, those sorts of things. So what we got was as we were trying to push at the State level to say, take some risk, get out there, get some new staff, do some new programs and so on, folks at the local level were saying, we don't want to get caught in a bind where we get somebody on board and then we have to go through a riffing procedure and so on and so forth. There is too much uncertainty. Small State minimums help with that. They will really help just get a stable base of funding.

A related issue. The more money that we can get in, the better. I would argue the rule of thumb that we try to use, and we never meet it, but it is a good one to start with is take a look at what you want to do with the program that you are designing and devel-

oping, figure out how much it is going to cost and then fund it, you know, at the level that it is going to take to do the job to meet the goals. I think that this really becomes a problem because what happens is, is that if you fund something at 80 percent or 50 percent, you know, whatever it happens to be, it doesn't always necessarily mean when you have a good program set up that you get 50 percent of the results. A lot of times you need to get a core of resources to get any results, that sort of thing, particularly around areas of the intensity of professional development, you know, of staff. You can't just do a couple of one-day wonders and, you know, fund it because that is all the resources you have and expect that people are going to have the time to be able to change the way that they are going about doing things. So really just a rule of thumb to say, let's design a program that is very clear about what its intent is, let's build a budget and not just an authorization, OK, but an appropriation, a commitment to an appropriation that really meets the mark and is able to do it. And I think those kinds of pieces of consistency will really send a strong message that the Federal Government's a partner that is right beside us. And that is the kind of partnership that we really need is somebody that is moving forward going north with everybody in Vermont, and I would say in the Nation because I think that the Federal Government's role really is to be out there saying, as a nation we need to deal with these things. It is not just Vermont. And I think that we recognize that as a State. We are not trying to insulate ourselves, but at the same time what we are saying is, it doesn't mean that one size fits all. That is the balance—that is the tough balance to meet during legislation.

I think we talked about a new role and responsibility. I have got some degree of hesitation with this. I have been working with a lot of people in the Federal bureaucracy in a lot of different programs. I am kind of utility infielder for the Department of Education so—I mean, I have done some work around Chapter 2, around Chapter 1, bilingual, not much around Drug-Free, but I am just starting to learn that one and the—there is a sense in the bureaucracy—there is a role and function that is kind of defined in the bureaucracy, and I don't think it is at the top level. I think that there is some visionary people at the top levels. I don't believe they go too deep into the organization. The piece of the organization that hits us, okay, that is out here is a piece that needs a lot of training and support around a very different role and relationship. We've really got to move away from the compliance mentality, you know, that that is the purpose and that is—I call it search and seize. Just that mentality that that is the role and that somebody's only successful if they find something wrong. I'll give you an example. We had a Chapter 1 monitoring at one point and they said—they had this finding and I said, is that a—you know, is that a finding that is very important? And what they basically said was, well, you can't go home with no findings, you know what I mean? And it just showed, you know, you don't get your meal ticket or whatever without the finding. So you had to—this one was one that we kind of put on when we can't find one. You are doing a great job. Thanks. It is really hard to have that relationship if we are trying to work together in a systemic way. I think that it is really got to change,

and I would argue that it is the kind of relationship that changed to things around sharing a risk. Not taking the risk, but sharing the risk and also just exchanging commitments to one another and what's going to be. That demands new kinds of behaviors and collaboration, new beliefs in people. Those things don't grow overnight because people have been doing their job well. You know, they've been doing the job the system asked them to do, and I think that that—that is going to take a long time. We are working hard on that at the State level. It is the same thing.

I am not casting aspersions because we sit in that kind of role and relationship issue, how do we deal with schools? And I am sure schools and communities are working out those same sorts of things with parents and other people. So I think that it does have to be a partnership, I think that it does have to be systemic in terms of the type of change. I think we have to accept the fact that the extent of change that we are reaching for is not just fixing around the edges and that if it becomes fixing around the edges Jeb Spaulding, I believe, mentioned we are going to wrap back 15 years, you know, that sort of a thing. If it becomes that, I think that we've wasted a terrific opportunity for some change. I think we are at a point where something can happen right now. People—you are starting to get a sense that people are moving north and sensing that we need to move forth. Appreciate all the work that you've done in that regard and I know you'll continue to do, and thank you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much. Used to have fun with the small State minimums when I was in House ranking on the Education Labor Committee and Bob was the——

Mr. MCNAMARA. That was a little easier to deal with. You used to argue whether it was .5 or .25. Those were good days.

Senator JEFFORDS. Carlene. All right, Mary.

Ms. SHERRER. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of Chapter 2. I became involved in Advisory Committee work prior to the beginnings of Chapter 2 when ESEA Title IV was in existence, so I go back a long ways. As a long-term Advisory Committee member, teacher for 28 years and administrator for 2, I come to you with much experience around these dollars. I worked on formulas, I have received many grants as a teacher and I have worked in on-site evaluations as an Advisory Committee member.

So before I share my thoughts about the future, I would like to describe two concerns about reauthorization. According to recommendations made by the Council of Chief State School Officers on reauthorization of the Hawkins/Stafford Amendments of 1988 entitled, "High Performance Learning Act," Chapter 2 Advisory Committees would be eliminated. These committees presently advise the State Education Agency on the formula and in Vermont assist with on-site evaluations at local school districts. Additionally, committee members help disseminate information about Chapter 2. By having the public informed about and involved in the process, these dollars are more protected than would be true without such local involvement.

My second concern revolves around the small State minimum that Bob mentioned. Without this protection Vermont would lose dollars valuable to students in the State. I am requesting then that

you continue to support both the continuation of State Advisory Committees representing the broad interests of parents, students, educators and community and also the small State minimum.

And now to the bigger picture. What can we do with funding to enhance restructuring? This question forces me to look at positives in Chapter 2 and components conducive to educational reform. I have concerns about the way dollars are presently fragmented. I think of how these dollars might serve to enhance one another. Let me speak for a moment about those thoughts.

As well as the need to maintain Advisory Committees, another positive of Chapter 2 likely to enhance all programs inherent in this reauthorization is its flexibility. Chapter 2 has been popular because of the diverse possibilities available to students, teachers and families. In Bakersfield, for example, ParentLink began with Chapter 2 dollars. ParentLink is used to inform parents and students and to make the school accessible to all residents. One story describes a parent who walked a mile each day to phone the school just to receive information. She had no touch tone phone of her own but was willing to walk to keep informed. That story demonstrates the part ParentLink plays in the Bakersfield community. Likewise, at a recent school board meeting parents requested that all taxpayers, including those families without children in school, be added to outgoing calls so they can be informed about and invited to participate in activities in the school.

The Bakersfield ParentLink is only one of thousands of programs in the State started with Chapter 2 dollars and taken over with with local dollars as a result of its success. Teachers with great notions, such as summer safety kits or artists in residence are able to realize their ideas as a result of the flexibility. Small numbers of dollars rejuvenate students, teachers and administrators. Likewise, these dollars allow creativity to flow and enhance school/community relationships.

As well as maintaining strengths of Chapter 2 during reauthorization, it will be important to support educational reform. What better tool do we have than Chapter 2's flexible dollars which allow districts to provide quality inservice, offer seed moneys for innovative projects and provide dollars to be used directly with students to enhance opportunities? Additionally, Advisory Committee members can certainly play an important part in aligning Chapter 2, State and school-wide goals through the on-site visits.

As for funding, all dollars should work to complement one another in local school districts. Chapter 1, Chapter 2, drug and alcohol, and Eisenhower notices of allocations and allotments should be received simultaneously and preferably planned for by the same advisory committee comprised of broad membership. In this way all moneys can be directed toward local system-wide school improvement activities rather than being fragmented and channeled into several different directions.

Stanley Pogrow in the May 26th Education Week issue speaks about the strength of Reading Discovery and HOTS. He says, "Solving the learning problems requires the best teachers, working with learning environments that are more sophisticated than those found in the general classroom." By pooling all our resources then

and heading them in like directions, we can provide teachers with strategies to enhance student learning.

Similarly, by channeling multiple grant dollars toward the National Education Goals, systems will move forward. Chapter 2's structure should serve as the primary vehicle for meeting these goals and promoting system wide school improvement activities at the State and local levels. The targeted areas of Chapter 2 allow for system-wide change by providing access to funding for all populations. Rather than further segregating and labeling students, these targeted areas focus on enhancing existing programs rather than populations. With increased dollars and slight modifications, the targeted areas in Chapter 2 will move us forward toward meeting the goals by the year 2000.

For Vermont, Chapter 2 has proven itself as an effective resource for significant school change. In reauthorization please remember the importance of providing flexible Federal resources that can be used by schools as they transform themselves for the 21st Century. Thank you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much. An excellent statement.

Carlene now.

Ms. BELLAMY. Now, finally. Senator Jeffords, as you know, I am Carlene Bellamy, Assistant to the Superintendent for Special Programs for the Washington Northeast Supervisory Union. In my current position I am responsible for managing the Chapter 1 and Special Education programs as well as coordinating assessment procedures and overseeing the instructional support systems for the schools in my district. I also come with prior experience as a Chapter 1 and Special Education teacher in a school undergoing substantial restructuring effort; that is, the Cabot School. And thank you for inviting me to present my perspective, ideas and concerns regarding the impact of Federal legislation on student outcomes.

In order to prepare students to meet the challenges of the 21st Century, educational reform must result in students meeting high standards which are consistently rising toward excellence. While higher expectations from all students, without exception, may be driving program improvement, the number of students considered to be educationally disadvantaged tend—has tended to increase in the process.

Concurrently, the refinement of Vermont Special Education rules and strict adherence to the eligibility criteria has led to an overall decline in the number of students receiving Special Education services, yet has added to the number of regular education students needing academic support.

Consequently, a larger at-risk population has emerged comprised of students with more diverse and intensive needs than have typically been served by Chapter 1. Unfortunately, along with the growing number of Chapter 1 eligible students, comes a shrinking Federal share of funding, fewer dollars generated by child count and a decrease in the number of students the Chapter 1 program is able to serve.

If more Chapter 1 dollars were allocated and applied to support school-wide efforts which focus on qualitative improvements, those

resources would reach more students without diluting the intent to supplement. The impact of increased program quality, as well as quantity, should continue to be directly linked to student outcomes.

In Vermont a state-wide effort to meet the needs of all students has called for the establishment of local comprehensive systems of support. One provision of support is the Instructional Support Team, which is a school-based forum for addressing students' needs through a process of collective problem solving, collaborative planning and the accessing of programs specific to each school's continuum of services. However, it should be noted that intervention plans developed by these teams are only as effective as the team's capacity to implement them. Frequently rigid program regulations and requirements preclude Chapter 1's potential to effect recommended plans.

If Chapter 1 programs are to ensure that financial resources result in the greatest possible benefit for disadvantaged students and if programs are to be held accountable for student outcomes, then regulations need to encourage school-wide collaboration and unity of purpose, promote educational best practices through coordinated staff development designs, foster innovative service delivery models which are responsive to changing educational needs, and require that clear standards be set and shared with students, parents and staff. Program intensity should center on Chapter 1's full participation in comprehensive systems of intervention, endorsement of authentic assessment and integrated models of teaching and learning.

Undeniably, Chapter 1 dollars have had a significant impact on raising the levels of academic achievement of disadvantaged youth. It is my recommendation that new and reauthorized Federal legislation support systemic changed which is linked to State and local reform efforts.

Broader interpretations of supplemental and flexibility are necessary in order to meet the demands of today's diverse and inclusive classrooms. Outdated notions of counting of numbers of minutes serve—numbers of minutes of service no longer fit the concept of added benefit when quality of services is genuinely considered and Federal policy needs to reflect that reality. Thank you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much, Carlene. Appreciate your testimony. It is very helpful and very critical to my better understanding of these programs, what kind of changes we may need. Bob, I agree with you that funding cycles for the programs in the ESEA should be coordinated. In a small State like Vermont that means, I suppose, you'd have one person wearing two or three hats trying to pull all of these things together, and we are going to try to work on that and see what we can do about that.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Thanks.

Senator JEFFORDS. I like your reference, to Edgar May's stump money, but I see that we need some flexibility to coordinate the funds from Goals 2000, Chapter 1, and Chapter 2. On the other hand, I am not sure just how that is all going to work. Do you have any suggestions what you'd like to see as to how we try and coordinate those programs?

Mr. MCNAMARA. I think if—under an ideal circumstance, I think it would take time to get there. I think that if you took a look and said, there is a real need to work on four basic pieces of work, I

think that we need to pay attention to things like educational restructuring, the teaching and learning that goes on, the partnerships that we build up and basically strengthening professional growth and development. And if you—and in that same kind of environment what you need is a situation where there needs to be very clearly stated content standards about what we expect kids need to know and be able to do, some performance standards about how well they need to be able to do it. And I think we do need to make some clear statements about what kind of environment needs to be available to be sure those kids have the opportunity to learn those things. And in that type of environment I think that different partners have different responsibilities. And if we could start to just walk across what would those responsibilities be in different sectors and define those, ultimately where the real flexibility could come is if people were behaving the way they needed to behave in the partnership and doing what they needed to do, what you would have is a school and community that would have a game plan based on the needs of their students and community, and it would be a game plan on how they are going to move forward on getting the results that they need to meet the goals. And that at that point it is for all students. And by the way, Goals 2000—excuse me, Goals 2000 doesn't include Special Education students. I would ask that that really should. That group was—it was obviously left out when—you know, during the legislation, the part that I read at least, but I think that it needs to be really reflective of what is it that the school and community need to do to make sure that the results for all students are very high. At that point then you start to say, well, where does the State play in? It isn't to go in and teach the kids, but it is a different sort of a support. We have some responsibilities. It is responsibilities in the same areas. We have responsibilities in teaching and learning, common core, curriculum frameworks to offer some support to link local curriculum, a good solid State system that really is authentic and so on. Those are our pieces of the pie. The local piece of the pie becomes the piece where you start to say, well, the locals have to have a curriculum that really is powerful that reflects that common core. They need to have those assessments that are ongoing so you can really modify instruction. You start to move out and talk about where the Federal comes in in issues like that. I really think that what we need—we could have the best assessment system in the world but, as Jeb Spaulding said, we are in an international economy. Vermont isn't insular anymore. We need to be competitive with across the world and we need to have standards that aren't just Vermont standards. We need to have some points of comparison. NAEP offered those. We participate in the New Standards project, which is an effort to try to offer some of those. So that with an assessment there is a piece in that way. But I think that what we need to do is to make sure that we realize that the job of all these partners is to make sure that what happens with kids is what makes—is what's really important. And that in that regard if a community has a plan, and is implementing a plan, and is accountable and measuring toward it, then I would argue that in this kind of environment you can offer a world of flexibility for the use of resources. I think that it becomes stump money when it is really not planned,

not thought through, not really accountable and reported on on a regular basis in a public way. And I don't mean like send a report to a state; I mean, a public collaboration with the community that those kids come from on how those students are doing. When that doesn't happen, I think that it is risky. I think a lot of time our categorical funding in the past has been based on a distrust; that if we didn't put a box around it, somebody would steel it, that sort of a thing. I think it is just a new way of thinking. If a community and school is willing to take the responsibility and the accountability for all students and the other pieces of the system are supporting it, I think that can be a new day. I think that really is a break the typical kind of a notion way of looking at what the relationship would be.

Senator JEFFORDS. Carlene and Mary, do you have comments?

Ms. SHERRER. Sounds good.

Senator JEFFORDS. Well, I want to thank you—all of you for very excellent testimony, very critical testimony. We look forward to working with you as we go forward in the reauthorization process, and we will be looking to you to keep us from going too far astray. Thank you very much. I think at this point we will take a 10-minute break.

(Recess.)

Senator JEFFORDS. Please be seated. There was no room in the schedule for that break, so we've got to go forward in order to try and keep on schedule. We have an excellent panel in store for us, Panel Number 3, Marlene Burke, President, Vermont NEA; Patricia Woodward, President of Vermont PTA; Don Jamieson, the Vermont School Board Association; and Bill Mathis, the Vermont Superintendents Association; and Tom Perry of the Vermont Headmasters Association. Wow. You've all got 1 minute. No, we are doing fine. And I just want to thank you all for coming. Looking forward to your testimony. You guys are all the head of the people in the front line here on these programs, and so we look forward to your testimony. We will start in accordance with those the way they are listed on the agenda, so that means, Marlene, go right ahead.

STATEMENTS OF MARLENE BURKE, PRESIDENT, VERMONT NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, MONTPELIER, VT; PATRICIA WOODWARD, PRESIDENT OF THE VERMONT PTA; DON JAMIESON, DIRECTOR, VERMONT SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION; BILL MATHIS, VERMONT SUPERINTENDENTS ASSOCIATION; AND TOM PERRY, VERMONT HEADMASTERS ASSOCIATION

Ms. BURKE. Good morning, Senator.

Senator JEFFORDS. Good morning.

Ms. BURKE. My name is Marlene Burke, and I am president of Vermont NEA. I represent over 90 percent of the teachers and educational support staff in this state's public schools. On behalf of our members, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to comment on the potential changes to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act being considered by your Subcommittee and would like to thank you personally for your continued interest and support in educational issues not only in this State but throughout the country.

This State is on the cutting edge of reform from the State department down to the classrooms of our public schools. Although there are many equally important aspects of ESEA to consider, I would like to focus my limited time on provisions of Chapter 1 that affect professional development. I believe that one reason that professional development is so important is that the research of the last quarter century, much of it Federally funded, is paying off. We have a strong and expanding knowledge base about how children learn. We also know that it requires a great deal of time, effort and individual attention for educators to couple this knowledge with action.

I draw your attention to four findings that have emerged from some of this research. Children from disadvantaged backgrounds have been equally disadvantaged by mistaken conceptions of their abilities, skills and the instructional approaches necessary for them to succeed in learning. All students, including the educationally disadvantaged, can achieve much more much earlier than previously thought possible, and failing to integrate across basic skills instruction and to integrate basic skills with more advanced thinking skills that give meaning to these skills and enable students to apply them in real life situations rob students of opportunities to succeed. To orchestrate basic and advanced skill acquisition to students, especially those who experience the challenges of poverty and limited English proficiency, requires highly complex teaching skills on the surface. At least these findings are similar and are familiar.

Both policy makers, such as your committee members, and educators, such as the members of my organization, have heard these similar words before. A solid knowledge base substantiates these findings and disproves the longstanding belief formulated in the 19th Century that some students cannot be expected to acquire a higher order of skills because of limitations in their inabilities. Because policy makers included education of disadvantaged children as a priority in Federally sponsored research efforts, some of the research on how students learn have taken place in classrooms serving children from poor and linguistically minority populations. These are considered most at risk.

Researchers found that these children come to school with intuitive knowledge about math, with elaborate communication and language although not formal skills, and impressive abilities in the arts of persuasion and negotiation, and that these skills blossom when students are provided the learning strategies that are needed to understand disciplinary subject matter and problem solving within and among disciplines. I believe we owe it to our students and to our future as a nation to realign our policy and practice and to provide support and opportunities for the educators to change their practice to fit new knowledge and circumstances. The teachers I know have always believed that all children can succeed. We continually seek new ways of approaching teaching that will achieve this goal. We also know that to transform education in order to assure that all children succeed, no exceptions, no excuses is a monumental task.

We as educators must reconstruct our conceptions of teaching, our conceptions of learning, we must learn new methods, we must

acquire new skills and assessment and adapt our practice to fit individual students' needs. Teachers in Vermont and elsewhere have been and are striving to develop the knowledge and the skills that we need to help all children succeed often on our own time. Just as we need to provide the structure and process to help the students construct meaning from new knowledge and experiences, so too do we as teachers need an infrastructure that helps us acquire and practice those new skills and knowledge. The way to do this is to create schools as learning communities for both teachers and students. Teachers' learning must become a routine part of their work within the schools where they teach. That means all teachers and other school professionals need the time to learn, to reflect, to assess and adapt. How can schools become centers of inquiry if we could not provide staff with the time to engage in inquiry? How can teachers monitor students' individual progress and design the means of diagnosing and attending to students' thinking and problem solving errors if they have no time for thinking and reflecting themselves? How can your policies in Chapter 1 reauthorization legislation create the environment for teachers and students in which both are continually expanding, learning, redefining their approaches to learning and expanding their knowledge?

May I make some suggestions as to policy recommendations? One, Chapter 1 legislation should treat professional development as one of the strongest levers for change in helping disadvantaged students succeed in regular school programs. Two, Chapter 1 legislation should promote some opportunities for all school personnel serving Chapter 1 students to participate in joint planning and professional development programs. It should also support school-wide projects to the maximum extent possible while still protecting the legislative intent of Chapter 1. And professional development in Chapter 1 schools must address new ideas and technologies related to organizational structures, pedagogical content, child development, social context of education, partnerships with parents and other stakeholders, and collaboration with other social service agencies. Four, professional development opportunities provided through Chapter 1 should reflect the state-of-the-art knowledge about adult learning and about how educators, teachers in particular, increase and update their expertise. States and schools should receive assistance in developing the knowledge and skills necessary to fulfill the intent of Chapter 1.

And may I just break for a moment and share with you a personal concern about professional development. I believe that it is a process and not an event. I think we have had events of professional development, those in the field, those in the classrooms, we often refer to it as spray and pray. A 1 day regional professional development day where all the teachers are brought in and someone from the outside comes in, spends two and a half hours spraying us with the latest information and then leaves praying that some of it sunk in. That to us is not professional development. As I stated, it is a process. It should not be an event. And it should be an ongoing process not only where information is given and questions and answers can be set in that context, but that that person or that group comes back to see what is being used, how it is being used, how effective is it, what are the—what are the prob-

lems with it if any and then continue on to the next stage of that development.

Vermont NEA cares deeply about ESEA. I refer you to the testimony of our parent organization, the National Education Association, for positions on many additional aspects of the act. I'll also attach to my testimony policy recommendations from the Council for Educational Development and Research which I found to be extremely helpful. I chose today to focus on professional development because I see it as the most immediate and powerful step to desired change and outcomes, and I want to thank you for this opportunity to share my ideas with you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much.

Ms. BURKE. One last piece.

Senator JEFFORDS. Go right ahead.

Ms. BURKE. Regarding Goals 2000. It needs to include other things. I don't think it includes art, and fine arts, and music and physical education, and I think it should.

Senator JEFFORDS. Patricia.

Ms. WOODWARD. Good morning. The Vermont PTA believes that the reauthorization process of the Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Act of 1986 presents excellent opportunity to re-examine the Federal role and responsibility in elementary and secondary education as well as its effectiveness in providing education and related services to children with special needs. The Vermont PTA will focus its comments on the parent family involvement component. And in your packet I have included information on how parents can become involved in their children's education as well as how educators can support and encourage parent involvement.

Schools and families must come closer together. A more positive home environment related to the school, increased parent expectations of their child's academic performance, parent involvement in the decision-making process and increased parent interest in schools are just some of the outcomes of a well-developed, ongoing, systematic and meaningful parent involvement program. When parents are involved in the educational process, their children do better in school. National surveys and reports continue to underscore the importance of parent family involvement in education.

Since 1988 school districts receiving Chapter 1 money have had to comply with the current parent involvement regulations. Traveling around the State of Vermont the last 6 years I have had an opportunity to meet with many parents, teachers and administrators.

Many school districts receiving Chapter 1 funding have demonstrated wise leadership by making parents' involvement a major component of their school plans. By making a concerted effort in getting families involved in the educational process, these schools are making Chapter 1 more effective assuring that the money spent in Chapter 1 will achieve the expected goals. However, I have been at schools that are not taking the Chapter 1 parent involvement component seriously. Other schools have policies that just aren't working, not effective or being ignored.

Everyone talks about how important parent involvement is; however, when asked what does parent involvement mean to them,

they have difficulty in answering. The Vermont PTA believes that parent involvement is the participation of parents in every facet of the education and development of children prenatal to adulthood recognizing that parents are the primary influence in children's lives. Parent involvement takes many forms, including the parent shared responsibilities and decisions about their children's education, health and well-being as well as the parents' participation in organizations that reflect the community's collaborative aspirations for all children.

The Vermont PTA would like to make a few recommendations to strengthen and improve the parent involvement component primarily of the Chapter 1 program but, quite frankly, parent involvement is parent involvement, and what I am going to say can go across everything in our schools. We need to clearly define what we mean by meaningful parent involvement. We need to add an additional national goal, as you heard me speak many times, that by the year 2000 every elementary and secondary school have comprehensive school and home parental involvement programs. We need to make an effort to focus on meaningful—not the token parent involvement, meaningful parent involvement activities that support and encourage home school communication in cooperation with school programs and children's progress.

We need training of parents in schools to work with each other by helping parents develop skills, they need to improve their parenting abilities and prepare their children to learn. More research on the barriers to meaningful parent involvement. Providing information for parents about what children are learning in school and how parents can continue that learning at home. Offering opportunities for parents to volunteer including and—again, training—you are going to hear training and meaningful through this—include and train parents in the decision-making role in school governance. Helping parents to be a good advocate for their children and developing partnership with business to enable parents to be able to volunteer in the school without loss of their pay. The current framework for parental involvement in Chapter 1 must be preserved. Parents must continue to be involved, again, in a meaningful way, in the planning, design and implementation of the programs and in the education of their children at home and in school. Ongoing training must be provided to the parents so that they can understand what is involved in those aspects of the Chapter 1. At the very least in this—in Chapter 1 they need to still have the annual meeting where parents receive Chapter 1 information, and they need to be involved in the developing of a parent involvement plan.

Development of parent school-based organizations that provide support and training to carry out the decision-making responsibilities. An annual evaluation of the parent involvement program, and a school policy developed with parents on the importance of meaningful parent involvement.

To assure that strong parent involvement policies are developed and implemented effectively, the Federal government must increase their monitoring of all schools' implementations of meaningful parent involvement. To be successful, strong, meaningful and comprehensive parent involvement programs must be promoted

and encouraged at all levels of government. The Federal government should create a Chapter 1 parent involvement center to provide support and technical assistance to the states in developing and enhancing parent involvement programs. States, therefore, would be able to provide technical assistance to the schools for strong and effective parent involvement. All parents, including those that do not speak English or have literacy problems must receive information in a language they can understand about Chapter 1. Parents need help from the school with funds for implementing programs, resources and materials, and help to carry out those programs. Training is a key component for a comprehensive and meaningful parent and family involvement program. Teachers and administrators must receive preservice and inservice training on the various aspects of parent involvement. Standards be developed for recertification of teachers and administrators in all areas of parent involvement. Higher education must provide for its education student required courses in parent involvement and, again, training for parents to ensure success and their meaningful participation in these programs in Chapter 1.

Any changes during this reauthorization must be based on sound research. We know that parent involvement enhances children's success in school; however, we need more research in identifying the barriers to parent involvement, we need more research in identifying the components of the successful Chapter 1 parent involvement programs and why they are successful, and then implement those models of successful parent involvement programs. And, again, more training for parents. A key focus of school restructuring and reform should be to provide an organizational setting that meets the needs of each child and family. A few examples, schools changing their structure to be more responsive to family needs and schedules. For instance, parent-teacher conferences may have to be scheduled in the evening, early in the morning before parents go to work. Parents may not be able to support their children in their homework every night. Meeting times for Chapter 1, or any other parent group or any other educational group in the school may have to be scheduled at night, weekends, early in the morning to enable parents that work to fully participate. The family has changed over the last two decades. Most schools have changed little to meet the needs of families. Parent involvement must go beyond those who are easy to reach. Schools must assure that all parents take part in parent involvement activities. Evaluation of parent involvement programs must be more systematically evaluated.

Schools that have made special efforts to develop strong, comprehensive and meaningful partnerships with their parents should be recognized, and those that do not take parent involvement seriously should be identified.

Parents should be involved in the evaluation process, and information should be reported where they could collect and synthesize the information. Parent involvement can be one of the most cost-effective ways to improve education. We have no territory to protect other than the best interest for all of our children and youth.

The Vermont PTA thanks you for inviting us in to share with you our concerns and recommendations during this reauthorization.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much.

Don. Could you pull the mike—fine.

Mr. JAMIESON. That is fine. Good morning. As a representative of the Vermont School Boards Association, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. It is especially nice, Senator, that you have this hearing right in our own backyard. We go to Washington once in a while to see you, and it is even nicer to have you back home where we can talk with you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Certainly nicer for me.

Mr. JAMIESON. Well, it is for us too. When one thinks of the ESEA, it is natural to reflect on Chapter 1. Chapter 1 has been around for quite some time. Not only is it the largest component of this act, it probably has had the greatest impact on our youngsters of any Federal program. It has become a real integral part of a budget and, believe me, this support from the feds for these disadvantaged youngsters and compensatory services is appreciated and it is relied upon by school boards. There are a few things that we've heard recently I think about criticisms of Chapter 1, criticisms saying are the skill improvements in the areas of reading, and writing, math, are they sustained over a long period of time? It may be true that there is some loss by these youngsters, particularly during the summer months, but I wonder what would happen if we did not have that money and those programs to bring up those youngsters from time to time in these very vital, basic skills.

It is been my feeling that—and my experience in looking at Chapter 1 youngsters that they do lose some of the skills and concepts from June to September, and I think that Chapter 1 can fill some of that vacancy that occurs. It seems to me that innovative programs that school districts can have during the summer that would utilize other agencies, such as the library, and give an enriching environment to those youngsters that might not have that environment during the summer. And I don't believe those programs would occur without the support of Chapter 1 funds. The same thing is true—some of the things that Pat talked about, we have parents—single parents, we have two parents working and we have a need for child care. And often youngsters are coming to school very early in the morning, being dropped off and need to be looked after and often parents aren't home in the evening until a little later. So there are some times there where programs that can help youngsters in basic skills could be put to use. And it is a nice way of supplementing the education that the regular classroom teacher gives youngsters rather than supplanting it. I have often wondered why we take youngsters out of a professional teacher's classroom and put them in the charge of an aide in place of the time that they would have in the regular classroom. It seems to me it would be nice if we could use more of our money to be sure that it is supplementing the professional services that are available to youngsters and not supplant them.

So I hope that the moneys that President Clinton has in his budget, he's got about a 6 percent increase, close to a half a million dollars for Chapter 1. I think that is a nominal amount. The three areas that I suggest that need attention, that is reaching all eligible children. As you know, we never seem to be able to reach all the youngsters that are eligible in the criteria set for Chapter 1,

and so increasing basic grants that go through the school districts is important, providing staff develop a program for all of those things that Marlene just mentioned to you, those are critical. We've got to have staff development, not only for the Chapter 1 teachers, but also for the regular teachers in the classroom and for the aides that work with our youngsters.

And, finally, I think it is important that we encourage research into the reasons specific to the Chapter 1 pupil as to why this group of students have the learning problems that they do. It seems to be some unique problems with these youngsters, and I don't think we've got the handle on it. So it is got to be not only good service, but it is probably they are going to have to be different services to meet these particular youngsters. It was mentioned earlier that Mr. Boudreau out of Arizona has been doing work in this particular area, and I would suggest that he might be of interest to you in finding that there are differences in the problems of youngsters in the primary units and intermediate grades and maybe a practice that we've had of making sure that those in the greatest need of services get Chapter 1 services first. And he questions that policy with some—I think with some good support.

I leave you with one more point on Chapter 1 and that if the services that Chapter 1 is provided by Federal funds should disappear, they would disappear because of the lack of funding that comes from Federal government. In this day and age you must be cognizant of what's happening with budgets and the cutbacks that we've had in our schools in order to get voter approval of the basic things we need, and should we not sustain the effort in Chapter 1, you cannot expect that the voters are going to approve more money for compensatory services. We are having a struggle providing the services that we have right now. And I don't think we are going to find additional services being approved by the voters.

In your letter last week, Senator, you asked about how could we improve the Federal role in education, and let me give you a couple of brief suggestions. Sometimes it seems to me the best way that the Federal government can support and help local school districts in the job of educating our kids is not—is by not hurting us, and it appears to me that there is a possibility of that happening in the very near future. I am talking about the contemplating—contemplated Energy bill. If that Energy bill goes through and if, indeed, school districts are expected to increase their budgets to pay for the tax on the energies that we use, it could be considerable. If you will just think a moment of heating all the school buildings in the State of Vermont during the long winter months, think of the illumination that we have and use, the dozens upon dozens of those big yellow school buses carrying youngsters to and from school about 180 days a year. Now I would hope that you would realize that we believe that the energy tax means that we are going to conserve energy. That is a laudable goal. Money that is going to Washington could also defray some of the deficit, and that is a laudable goal too, but I suggest to you that there is a greater goal than those two that this Nation has, and that is the education of its young people. And, therefore, why would the Federal government want to use local school districts as a Federal tax collector when we are having a difficult time collecting taxes to operate our

own schools? So that bill could very well cause a lot of holes in budgets that I think we would find extremely difficult to fill. So I urge you to watch that and maybe give an exemption to local school districts.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you, Don. Good point, and a troubling one.

Mr. JAMIESON. There is a couple other things.

Senator JEFFORDS. Sure. Go right ahead.

Mr. JAMIESON. You know, I think we've talked about it before, the arbitrage regulation that the school boards have; that we have in the past invested some of our funds, particularly when we have extra money, a bond issue or something like that, and know that moneys can be put to good use in the district. We've had the experience in the past of having quite a bit of money in certain of our towns that is derived from arbiters and it is been helpful, but since the changes in the regulations, I find that a lot of school boards don't bother to arbitrage. Why arbitrage, you know, when you've got all the difficulties and you are going to ship them off anyway. So it might be that that money sits in the bank in a checking account somewhere and not drawing interest and so on, and someone else benefits from that particular—interest-free loans. So I hope you will think about the need to make some changes in the arbitrage.

Also the Administration's School Reform bill was originally set—was to set standards for what students should know and be able to do and then to help give us a system to evaluate the progress that the youngsters are making in our schools that are making those standards. Changes in this bill recently have been rewritten, and it is a little bit disturbing to me. They set up a new agency called National Education Standards and Improvement Council in that bill, and this council would certify national curriculum, it would set standards of State tests and a new series of opportunity to learn standards. There would be a new Federal commission to define the opportunity to learn standards. I think teachers should know what knowledge they are using, and is it the best knowledge that they are using in the classroom and what kinds of material, what kinds of technology they are using. In other words, the Federal government, if this bill should pass, would be doing what I try to keep school boards from doing, micromanaging the school. And I think they are dealing with the means, the input. I hope we don't get the Federal government in a position of using the old top down type of change method of implementing the restructuring process that we have going in this country right now, particularly what we've got going in Vermont. So I would hope that you would be sensitive to the original intent of that bill, which I think was good, in saying, okay, let's set some high standards. They should know what they should be able to do, and help us set up a good measuring system, an assessment of these youngsters and of our schools to see if they are getting the job done and then let the professionals and let the local districts do the job and hold them to those standards.

My last suggestion has to do with the compartmentalization of the Federal and State governments which leads to a separate delivery of services to families and children. It seems to be—it is a natu-

ral thing that we divide things up. We have all kinds of departments in State level, we have all kinds of departments down there in the Federal government. We even have committees in the State and in Congress that deal with particular parts of the budget. And when we do that we seem to forget that the services needed by youngsters are numerous. And Pat has talked about the family and the family's needs have changed, and many of the functions and responsibilities today that were distributed elsewhere seem to be placed upon the schools. And we've accepted many of them, probably almost too readily, but the main purpose of schools is educating youngsters.

And so, believe me, I think what we need is help and we need help from other agencies, whether it is mental health, human services, employment. We need those together to look at the family and the—and their youngsters. And so if there is any way it might help to break the gridlock with them that we have, if there is any way to keep in your focus as a central point families and children as a whole and the services that come into that and see if you cannot stimulate us to cooperate and communicate with one another so that we will have a better delivery system to our families and to our children, at no more, maybe even less cost to the taxpayer. Thanks.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much. Very excellent statement. Dr. Mathis.

Mr. MATHIS. Good morning. I am Bill Mathis. I represent the Vermont Superintendents Association, and I too want to thank you for bringing this to Vermont and giving us a chance to visit with you about this very, very important bill.

First, I would mention that I have read a number of position papers put out by vested interest organizations and professional organizations on the reauthorization of this bill, and the one thing that comes through is that each of them want to invest their point of view. That is understandable, but there is a danger there because if there is too much of that, we may lose sight of what we are trying to do is improve education and that we may, in essence, cause more bureaucracy than what we would really like to have.

First, I would mention that ESEA programs have just been very good, they've been very successful and they've been a tremendous asset for us and local schools. I would mention in particular Chapter 1, Chapter 2 has been extremely useful, so has Eisenhower moneys been a real blessing and a real help for us improving education, and the Drug-Free Schools money as well. I would say that Chapter 1 is a bit too bureaucratic for Federal regulations that need to be lightened up, but other than that, it is just been a great boon and a positive asset. Trying to hit this entire bill in 5 or 6 minutes is awfully difficult. I'll hit five major themes or five major recommendations and then four little things that I think are important.

Senator JEFFORDS. Don't hesitate to supplement it, any of you, with additional material if you want. We will make it part of the record so no one—I don't want you to feel too constrained.

Mr. MATHIS. All right. There is a lot of talk about the national goals, and I think that is very important. And in terms of the national goals I have seen some very nice documents put out by the

Federal government on the national goals. They are very pretty, they have three colors, they are usually on parchment and things of that sort and they look real good on the wall, but the thing is, if you want to get them off the wall and away from these lofty ratified conferences, people who steeple their fingers and say pompous things sometimes, we've got to be able to put those things into action that affect schools, that affect children. Oftentimes they just stay right there on the wall and they don't make any difference. And so in my recommendations I want to try to hit a couple of things that would help us make them real.

The first thing that is been mentioned by other people is a major emphasis on authentic assessment. We talk a great deal about accountability, standards is on everybody's mind, curriculum improvement, the national goals, but unless we have good, measurable ways of dealing with these things, they will be nothing more than more words. I have been—I ran State testing programs and I have helped on designing of national assessment, but the thing is, is that unless we can get some authentic assessment beyond standardized tests, we are not going to make it. We've got to start asking questions about, how do we measure that the kid is an involved, responsible citizen? How do we measure that? We need to measure that. That is very, very important. And there is a great emphasis in the talk in Washington about shifting from auditing and compliance bases to performance bases, but unless we have ways of measuring that performance base in authentic, meaningful ways, then we will not achieve those goals. That is the first recommendation.

The second is that is to use mechanisms like Chapter 2, Eisenhower and the alcohol and drug money and to stay away from the traditional categorical programs. Chapter 1 is still part of the traditional mechanism. I think that needs to be loosened up. I think there are a number of problems—perspectives, and I think Bob McNamara mentioned it earlier, that the people inside of beltways seem not to trust what's happening in the rest of the Nation. But it has to go out there and we have to tie this back to the performance with authentic assessment as our means of accountability rather than the clanking, ponderous and thunderous mechanisms we have now.

Third recommendation is to emphasize teacher and administrator retraining. Very, very important, and I think Molly's talked to this earlier. We have a generation of teachers and administrators, including myself, who really need to be brought up to speed in terms of new methods of teaching, for hire order, for student-directed learning, for critical thinking, and they need to be helped and assisted in a continuous way to improve what we are doing. And that isn't the one-shot method; that is a continuous program of professional improvement. So everywhere we can is to push that.

One of the ways of doing that comes to my fourth recommendation and that is to integrate, merge and consolidate programs. And the council of two State school officers have put together the notion of clustering similar programs. I think that is a very good idea. I think they got a little bit timid because what they did was say keep the categorical nature and then allow the states to merge them or allow the local to merge them. I think we ought to look at merging

them in Washington first because, like us, they have their own bureaucracies and the Chapter 1 people and the Special Ed people, these programs need to be merged, but they represent independent systems which do not necessarily talk the same language nor do they use the same set of rules. We are often asked to do very contradictory things by those particular programs, and I really think that that really has to start in Washington. If we can—if we have to fall back to clustering with permissive legislation for the states and locals, that will help. I also think that all the professional development activities need to be clusters as well.

The fifth recommendation I would give to you is to fund the parenting programs and the early education programs. The research clearly shows that that is where payoff is, and that when we start looking at the greatest predictors of achievement, we are brought back to the role of the family and in cooperation with the schools. There has been some push by some people to really say we should go to the high school grades. Don was referring to that earlier. I don't know that we should. We get ——

Senator JEFFORDS. I am sorry, the high school what?

Mr. MATHIS. Push Chapter 1 programs more into the high schools. I would love to do that, but the greatest payoff is in early education and parenting. If we have to make those choices, I would rather go for the early education and really get that strong foundation early on when we can be most effective. There is some people who are advocating that we mandate that schools take on an assessment of parent education needs, and provide programs and evaluate how well we are doing in that. I would love to see the language more permissive to allow us to do that but not to mandate those kinds of programs. We can hardly do what we are doing now with the resources we've got, let alone taking on a broader mandate. And I think it is wrong to use Chapter 1 or any other Federal program to mandate actions across the board in terms of the school. People forget sometimes that with 6 percent Federal funding, the Federal Government's really a minor stockholder in the play, and unless they are willing to put that funding mechanism up to carry their mandates, they really shouldn't be doing it.

Some minor points. There is some people that want to use this reauthorization as a chance to push school choice. At this point in education we need focus, we don't need fragmentation. Competition in the world is often touted here and, of course, we have to be competitive, but we seem to forget that we need to be cooperative and that we need to work together. And, finally, the research clearly shows that choice—school choice mechanisms just don't work and it is a silly little political pseudosolution that we shouldn't waste time on.

I think we should keep—the second minor thing is we should keep the supplement, not supplant regulations. Don's just mentioned it. If you get rid of that, that is a little pocket of protecting leading edge money. If that was taken away, if that money was not protected, I am afraid it would be sucked straight into the operations, and I think that is a real danger. So keep the regulations as they are on that.

There is some stuff about the implementation dip that people are asking. Again, it gets us back to funding. I face a situation now in

which we have negotiated a longer school year. The local district people are saying, we don't want to pay for that, but we have to have that sustained funding base via State or Federal behind us and not such reliance on the property tax if we are to sustain the energy for educational change. I cannot do that locally. I fight real hard to do it with some success, I might add, but at the same time I cannot be—change takes a long time, and unless I have that steady funding base there, it is not going to happen.

Last minor point, I had mentioned a personal thing, is that there is also a reauthorization for Native American programs. That population has truly been disenfranchised, and I would urge that they be represented properly when this bill is reauthorized.

In quick summary, keep and expand the program; it is working well. Keep new assessment methods as a key. Use incentive systems rather than regulatory systems. Also training and retraining is the key to all other change, and that needs to be pushed as well. Cluster the programs and emphasize parenting in early education. Thank you very much.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you. Tom.

Mr. PERRY. Good morning, Senator. I would like to, first of all, tell you I hate to be last, but I thank you for inviting me to speak this morning. I represent the principals from the State of Vermont, and I guess you could say that I represent the where the hay actually gets down to the ponies. We are here where the rubber hits the road, and some of those things that I see that we have to be careful of as well as what we might do to make us a little bit better in the use of Chapter 1, Chapter 2 and the rest of the program. I mentioned those two things because those are what affect me most; however, I mention them very positively because they are a necessity in our schools right now. If you think about the way we have reorganized or restructured schools, you find that one of the keystones has been the use of Chapter 1 and of Chapter 2 funds because the recession has slowed us down a bit. Luckily we've had a way to keep things at least moving. I am a little bit concerned that as it slowed us down, we now have everybody that I can think of trying to find ways that they can spend Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 funds to better help them in their needs. I would ask you to do what you are known for best. You've always supported education and supported our children, and those should be the two things that are looked at when you make your decisions in Washington as to how this money may be used. Very important that children are the key word, I believe. The families and children are a necessity, but children are the key word.

The next thing is our services have been diluted to a point because funding has either not kept up with the need or funding has been moved. And that is one of the other concerns that principals have. As we use populations as a basis for funding, you find that as it moves around, communities are starting to be very fearful of starting programs or keeping them. Consequently, when you ask for an increase—and it is my firm belief and most principals', that a teacher teaching children how to read has much more long-term benefits than a tutor working one on one with somebody else designating what needs to be covered as the benefit. But we are losing that more and more we are becoming schools with tutors, and the

basic reason for that is the expense. And Chapter 1 is one of those areas that if it were increased, would be very important.

Second thing is the only way you actually restructure schools and change those things is to be able to have some long-range planning. If we plan by the year, we become very poor as far as we can put out a lot of fires, but we actually never improve or progress. We need some way to look at the moneys that are appropriated in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2, and school districts and school boards need to know that they can count on that money for a certain time period, not that they may have it next year and may not have it the next year.

We should look at being collaborative. We've done that in everything else that we do, but one of the things that I looked at was the drug and alcohol moneys that we get which have been a sincere benefit to all of our schools, but things to think of. A personal experience, in my school—and I only have 200 elementary students. In my school we use drug and alcohol money, which is used by our health department, our guidance office. Then coming from outside the school we have a DARE program, which is funded through the law enforcement, and then we also have Act 51, which is human services. Try and keep track of all those things that you need to meet for requirements with the same thing. It reaches a point where in a small school where you have one administrator you just kind of say, I don't have time to apply for funding for those kind of things and you do, you know, the basic necessities. If there is a way that all of these things could be listed as information and the collaborative use of those groups could be worked out, think of the benefit it would be to our schools and our districts. Just to know what's there and what's available to you is a plus when you are all alone.

The flexible use of money is very important. As we change, we must train our teachers differently, we must train ourselves. I would have to be—like Bill, I have been in this business a long time and we do a lot of things and have some beliefs that might need change. We need to not show them something that is neat; we need to train them the things that work and we need to use it for a while. And that costs money and it costs time. And those are the things that we really have to be aware of. The funds do need to be flexible, but I—as I stated right at the beginning, I think the flexible—the flexibility has to be denoted that how it affects children. Other than that, we will feel that the uses for a lot of different things will dilute the program one more time. And I don't think that the taxpayers of Vermont and probably the Nation can afford to fund everything that we might ever want to do. If we—you know, if we say it is elementary and secondary school, then let's look at that. I really hate that Pell grants overspend, that they may take money out of elementary and secondary school funds. Those kinds of things just should not be allowed.

Just to go through quickly because, as I say, I am last, you've heard all these things a million times. Our communities are fearful of using Federal money because they know, first of all, it may or may not be there, but their belief right now is that it won't be there. So when you request that we improve or start a breakfast program, that we offer school lunch during the summer, any of

those things, right now it is very difficult to get a community to agree to do that, and it is basically the fear of the unknown, I guess I would say. We need a focused and clear assessment. There is many assessments out there. We develop new programs and then we assess them with a standardized test that was developed 10 years ago. You need to have—if you have a new program, you also have to have an assessment for that program that is current. You cannot use something that is in the past. A lot of times when you say there is a dip, the dip is that we are not teaching something that is not tested on a standardized test, you can only test what you teach your children. You can't test them on things you don't teach them without having a dip. So that would be one of the other things.

The—in conclusion, as it does reach the children, I guess one of the important things that I say is that all States need to be involved as far as the collaborativeness of what's available to schools. We do not know that all States do it differently. We need the Federal help to do that. That is probably the most important thing if we are going to make changes nationwide, because we are all different, but there is a lot of things that—you can steal the best but not what works here. What works in Vermont might not work in New York City, but some of the things we do would work there and some of the things they do would work there. Thank you, Senator.

Senator JEFFORDS. Very excellent statement, Tom. Appreciate the time you've put in it, all of you. It is very helpful information, though I think you've raised a lot more problems for me than maybe I wanted to hear. I get the drift certainly on much of what you are saying. I guess one of the critical areas that I am concerned about is how we do try and find answers to these real needs, and yet there are no resources really available to do so. In particular, there is no question in my mind, and I agree with you, that we need to do more with parents, we need to do more with coordinating after school time and all of those things, but at the same time where do you find the resources to do that? You can't ask the teachers. You get into trying to work with the parents on individual schedules and work with each of the kids and the parents together. Are you going to use the teachers or are you going to suggest that we have to find other resources available to do that? I would like some of your thoughts on that. That to me is the most critical in many respects—not the most critical, but what you do with the kids when both parents are working and how you try to get the parental involvement at the same time, which everybody agrees is very important, but no one seems to know where are the resources going to come from and how you are going to do that.

Mr. MATHIS. If I could. There is a couple things that we are doing. We don't have the resources and a lot of it we are taking out of our hide. We really push community volunteers. We've got some wonderful community volunteers that are helping us. I think some relaxation on the Chapter 1, and Mitzi Beach and the State has helped us a great deal. We use some of the programs in Chapter 1 to provide the after school programs to make them truly supplemental to the regular instruction. We use Chapter 1 to fund their summer programs so that we won't have that summer loss that Don was talking about and things of that sort. Now we've had

some progressive and wise use of these resources to fit that in. We need to be able to do that more easily, but in terms of the overall money and in terms of the problem, we are way off.

Mr. JAMIESON. If I may. We love to try to get something for nothing, and we are good at it in the school business. We milk the cow about 40 times a day as the song says, and the person that we ask to do the milking most of the time is the regular classroom teacher. We spend an awful lot of rhetoric on restructuring our schools, but I don't think you can restructure your schools and have a teacher in the classroom working with the youngsters, which is the primary responsibility of that teacher, and also having that teacher involved in all of these new things in restructuring education as needs to be done. So we are trying to get something free, and I think the answer to the question is time. I think we've got people that can make the change, can make it happen, but people have to have the time. If they are going to have the time, it takes money. And so you have to pay for those things to get done. And it doesn't seem to me that we can do the job of saying—of meeting all the needs that we've stated that—State and local goals for education and expect it be done along with business and usual in the same amount of time.

Senator JEFFORDS. Marlene.

Ms. BURKE. Well, he just said what I would like to say. The other thing I believe very strongly in is when schools restructure, it is not only the time that is a critical element, but it is the fact that the restructuring must take place at the classroom teacher level. If they are not directly and importantly consistently involved in that restructuring, it is—you are paying lip service to something. They must be involved because that is where—that is where the restructuring is going to take hold. They must be directly involved, and that requires time. And, as Don said, time does translate into money.

Ms. WOODWARD. Can I add?

Senator JEFFORDS. Yes, sure.

Ms. WOODWARD. And I am not going to agree with my friends here 100 percent.

Mr. JAMIESON. Can we turn the mike off, Patty?

Ms. WOODWARD. In the folder that I have given you there are some sheets in there on how parents can be involved with their children's education and how educators can encourage parent involvement. The biggest thing that it does take is time, and in the world of parents I have a real problem that everything that we do has to equate with the dollar sign. Parents are all volunteers. My role as being a State president is a volunteer position. The schools that I work with and the parents that I work with, we do not take any money out of the school budget to be able to have effective and meaningful whether parent involvement programs or parenting programs. We try to work together on all—on a volunteer basis with the resources that we provide through the PTA to be able to bring in key people. Remember, in my testimony—to bring in key people to talk about those particular issues. And the PTA spends a lot of time going around the State trying to train parents on the various issues that do affect them and their most important responsibility as being a parent. And in my testimony there is a com-

ponent to be able to move further with that, but I would feel real bad if we were going to talk about parent involvement and we have to equate it with dollars. I would kind of like to have us look at what we already have, what is already available and then expand on it and start working on that right away because, remember, the parents' agenda and—teachers are parents, school board members are parents, superintendents are parents, and principals are parents, and if we could just all come together and sit at the table and talk what's best for our children, then we are going to be able to move forward with the agenda. And then afterwards, after we get going, at that time talk about money, but don't let money be the barrier to stop meaningful discussion right now.

Senator JEFFORDS. I don't think anybody would disagree with that. I just also think you have to think of the poor teacher, and my sister is one, my mother was one, and you have all day long and then you are saying each family should be involved and the teacher should be involved with each family in the evening to try and work out the problems at the home which are interfering with education. And I don't know just how that is going to all happen in a meaningful way as you emphasize, rather than being just "spray and play" as you say. I don't want to get too far, we've got other panels, but you've certainly given us a lot of insight into the problems and it is a resource problem. And if we don't recognize that, we are not going to solve it. And money is a resource that is needed if you are going to try and get meaningful involvement and not lip service. You've raised a number of issues. I deeply appreciate your testimony. Thank you very much. I am going to move the lunch hour. If there is anybody that is going to be critically affected by that on Panel 5—6 rather, I guess, let me know, but I think we will move the lunch hour to 12:30 and try to make that deadline. I think we will take another brief break and then—I have something I have to do right now, and then we will come back and try to make our schedule.

(Recess.)

Senator JEFFORDS. I would like to call Panel 3, Maxine Brandenberg, President of Vermont Business Roundtable; Winton Goodrich, Executive Director of the Vermont Chamber of Commerce Business/Education Partnership; and Noreen O'Connor, Executive Director of the Vermont Council on Vocational-Technical Education. If they would please come forward. When you are ready, Maxine, you can go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF MAXINE BRANDENBERG, PRESIDENT, VERMONT BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE; WINTON GOODRICH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE VERMONT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BUSINESS/EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP; AND NOREEN O'CONNOR, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE VERMONT COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Ms. BRANDENBERG. Thank you, Senator Jeffords, for inviting us today and having this opportunity to talk with you.

I am Maxine Brandenberg, and I am President of the Vermont Business Roundtable, and I am here to speak on behalf of the Roundtable and its education agenda.

The Roundtable is a nonpartisan group of chief executives from 125 Vermont organizations, fellow Vermonters committed to achieving a healthy economy and preserving Vermont's unique quality of life.

The Roundtable believes that education is a critical component of any prosperous economy, and that we must build a superior education system now in Vermont to ensure economic vitality and our unique quality of life in the next century.

I am going to focus today really on what coincides very much with what was described as the themes of reauthorization rather than on the technical specifics of the act because a great deal of the work the Roundtable has done really parallels many of those themes. In our original position paper on education in Vermont called, Vermont's Unspoken Danger, we examined the skills and the education that our children will need to succeed in the next century, and we concluded several things including the fact that at a time when the value of a need for education is increasing, Vermont faces the danger now and into the 21st Century of having an educational system that is average at best. Technological advances in transportation and communications have made it possible for Vermont businesses to sell their products throughout the world and at the same time goods that travel around the globe are purchased in Vermont. People near and far visit Vermont to vacation or spend time being educated in our State schools and colleges. People from Vermont also travel extensively themselves to other places in the world.

Our businesses need workers, skilled workers who can survive and prosper in this increasingly competitive and global market. The need for skilled workers is felt directly or indirectly by virtually all employers no matter how large or small at every level of the employment spectrum.

The changing workplace of the future is going to require very different skills from the past. Previously the emphasis was on the ability to remember facts, perform discrete, routine tasks, make fundamental calculations and follow directions. Today, and in the future, we are going to be focusing on interpersonal and integration skills. The ability to work as a team and to build a team, the ability to solve problems and have analytical skills, the ability to analyze information, not just recall it. And there is a growing need to find creative solutions to new problems rather than applying previous solutions to past problems.

Today in our schools there certainly is some good news. We have student assessment portfolios in math and writing in the fourth and eighth grades, the New American Schools grant, Vermont only one of eleven winners from nearly 700 applicants, our $10 Million National Science Foundation grant. Nevertheless, there are also very persistent problems.

Seventeen and a half percent of the 19 year olds that were living in Vermont in 1990 had dropped out of high school. Moreover, in that same year only 62.5 percent of seniors continued their education within 6 months of high school, and one of every eight Vermonters who started college did not return for the sophomore year.

Our Vermont students demonstrate only average performance on SATs. In 1991-1992 they scored six points above the national aver-

age in verbal and eight points below in math. Mediocre performance will simply not be enough in the next century.

Our education costs have grown very, very considerably, with more and more being shouldered by local communities. Local school spending has increased 148 percent since 1983. State expenditures have increased 102 percent, and during the same period the Consumer Price Index increased only 40 percent and total public school enrollment rose by less than 5 percent.

Vermonters want adequate education for our schools, and the business community is willing to support the financing of our schools, but these figures indicate that in the last 10 years our spending increases have greatly outpaced our enrollment and yet we do not have the kind of commensurate increases in performance to show for it.

This performance record coupled with these escalating costs prompted the Roundtable to make education a very high priority and to focus our resources on improving our schools.

We've been looking at education since 1989, and we are very committed to providing the best education possible to Vermont children. As a matter of fact, last week we awarded the first of a new Medallion award that we are annually giving to a Vermont public school. It was a $5,000 unrestricted gift, and the winner was the Cabot School system where they've demonstrated significant restructuring, innovation and results in terms of what the children's achievements in learning are.

We've proposed several things including restructuring teacher compensation. Historically teachers salaries have been determined only by length of service and years in education, not as in other professions, by effectiveness and results. Our Reward for Performance model is a plan that links compensation to professional competence and student outcomes combined with more decision making and authority for the teacher in the classroom level.

We also are a strong supporter of state-wide assessment, which includes all schools and all children. Such a program is consistent, which is essential to our belief that restructuring must include accountability and be outcome based.

The Roundtable has received the commitment of over 250 Vermont employers to consider the transcripts and academic portfolios of high school graduates as part of the entry level hiring process. "Performance Counts" sends the message to students that what you know, what you can do and how well you do in school really matters.

The Roundtable's most recent initiative, The Market Makes the Decision: A Model for School Choice, proposes school choice as a way to provide an external stimulus for change and elevate the quality of education in Vermont. The Roundtable model calls for a plan that is fair and balanced, that offers access to high-quality information, that respects local schools and communities, and that is consistent with Vermont's current restructuring effort and that works within the current economic climate.

School choice means that students and families would choose where they'll go to school regardless of where they live or their financial resources. Instead of being assigned to a school, they get to select their school.

Vermont has a long history of school choice. One out of every four Vermont communities, so-called tuition towns, already has some form of publicly funded school choice. And some larger districts, Burlington for example, offer intradistrict choice. Still other Vermonters have school choice by virtue of where they choose to live, in other words, those who have the economic means to make that choice.

We feel the school choice would empower parents by expanding the options for parents, students and educators, thus meeting the needs of more learners; they would increase the accountability because it would focus on the tangible results within schools; it would offer schools flexibility because they could expand their offerings or focus on particular programs; it would encourage school improvement because effective schools would be rewarded; it would enhance parental commitment to their children's school because they selected it; and most importantly, increase the likelihood that the right school is linked to the right child.

Since school choice is already working for some of us, we'd like to make it available to all Vermonters. The reasons for our enthusiasm behind this initiative are really very basic; we must have a better educated work force or we will suffer a rapid decline in our standard of living. We must have intellectually challenged graduates or we will have an uninspired culture.

What do Vermonters say about these issues? The model for school choice is consistent with what Vermonters say they want. Last fall the Roundtable retained an independent research firm to study Vermonters' attitudes toward school choice and education. The firm interviewed 357 parents statewide; that is, parents of children who were in public schools.

Sixty percent of the Vermonters said they believe they should be able to send their children to any public or nonreligious private school they choose, even if the school is outside their community. An even greater percentage of low-income parents said they should be able to choose their children's schools dispelling the myth that school choice is a tool of the privileged.

Forty percent went a step further and said they would, indeed, consider sending their children to schools in other communities if this were an option.

And almost half the parents interviewed said that Vermont schools were doing only a fair or poor job of preparing children for the world of the future.

We feel this research suggests that parents understand that choice will empower them and will help their children cope with the rapidly changing world and will lead to better schools and ultimately better education.

Because of the changing needs of Vermont employers, the public education system must teach appropriate skills to Vermont children. The existing K-12 educational system is not graduating Vermonters who will meet the emerging and more demanding skill requirements of the 21st Century. For Vermonters to succeed in the workplace tomorrow, we need to succeed in the classroom today.

An education system focused on learning outcomes, not only education inputs, is essential to develop significant and lasting improvements in the education of Vermonters. Federal initiatives

should be flexible to assure maximum return on investment combined with accountability based on outcomes. High standards linked to effective assessment, teacher compensation linked to performance and school choice for students and their families are some of the means by which we can have such a system. The goals of all of our education initiatives are to elevate dramatically the quality of education in Vermont for our children today and improve the job prospects tomorrow.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much.

Senator JEFFORDS. Winton, please proceed.

Mr. GOODRICH. Good morning. I am Winton Goodrich, the executive director of the Vermont Chamber of Commerce Business/Education Partnership. I come before the ESEA Reauthorization Committee today to present testimony that reflects the views of business people and educators who participate in community partnerships with our organization. Thank you for inviting me to participate on behalf of the Vermont Chamber of Commerce in this process.

The mission of the Vermont Chamber of Business/Education Partnership is to improve the quality of lifelong education for Vermonters and to increase the level of economic opportunity within the State. The VCB/EP—and I'll use that acronym because it is a whole lot shorter than the name—will strive to accomplish its mission by focusing on business/education partnerships that will lead to systemic reform of the relationship between the school, business and the community.

The VCB/EP establish to support Goal 4 of the Green Mountain Challenge; that is, Vermont parents, educators, students and other citizens will create powerful partnerships to support teaching and learning in every community.

A basic overview of our goals; create opportunities for communication between educators and business people; provide a data base clearinghouse for research and model partnerships; establish professional development programs for educators that encourage community involvement; and assist schools with restructuring initiatives; also to coordinate statewide activities with organizations which have similar missions.

My testimony today will focus on the following areas, the changing mission of schools; America 2000 goals, students ready to learn, 90 percent graduation rate, all children competent in core subjects, first in world in math and science, every adult literate, safe and drug-free schools; school outcomes, i.e., Certificate of Initial Mastery and apprenticeships; partnership models; the impact of education on the economy, that is, standard of living; linkage between labor and education also technology; and finally on learning styles research.

The delivery of educational services in Vermont and nationally is currently undergoing dramatic change. Schools are transitioning, as is society, from the industrial era to the information age. Factory model schools, historically, were organized to meet the economic needs of a society that was rooted in industrial hierarchy. The information era schools are redirecting the way education is delivered to meet the current and future needs of students who will be the 21st Century decision makers. The economic viability of the

next generation will be directly linked to how society and schools address the need to change and utilize technology to access knowledge and information.

A great deal of dialogue has occurred concerning the relationship and rationale for business and education to work together. It is the sole mission of school to create—is it the sole mission of school to create employability skills for students or to create productive citizens in society?

The publication, America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages, the U.S. Department Labor SCANS Report and the Vermont Common Core of Learning all focus on the achievement of essential skills. To synthesize the research that was the basis for these documents, today's students must be able to communicate; problem solve; demonstrate citizenship skills on the local, State, national and global level; understand diversity and the interdependence of people; work cooperatively; maintain physical and emotional health; contribute to the economic well-being of society; and effectively utilize technology to access information and increase knowledge.

Society and business are becoming more outcomes driven. For schools to be successful they will inevitably have to follow this lead. Through the medium of business community, VCB/EP creates authentic learning opportunities for elementary, middle and high school students. Job shadow, internships, mentoring and student apprenticeships are but a few examples of programs where students start to make relevant career connections with the broader community.

The point I intend to make today is that schools are rapidly changing to meet new societal demands. Schools are organizing curriculum and programs that are relevant to the real world that students will experience when they enter the workplace. Education is the pivotal link that can help the American labor force continue to be competitive. There are many needs that must be met.

First and foremost, educators, parents and community members must recognize a problem exists. Joint vision and agreement on what the problem is and a plan of action must be established. Educators must focus long-term professional development goals on creating programs and curricula that deal with the high skills identified in "SCANS" and "Common Core." Federal funding and technical assistance can create the opportunities and encouragement for educators and school boards to restructure schools for these high-performance outcomes.

As schools elevate student expectations, the social and academic needs of students at risk of failing will become more prominent. One of the ways in which ESEA funding can help defuse the problem is to expand funding for curriculum development and assessment that concentrates on programs that meet the diverse learning styles and personal needs of all students. The effectiveness of innovative curriculum development will be contingent upon the partnerships generated between parents, businesses and the school. Definitive student outcomes should drive this process that will eventually connect with postsecondary training and lifelong learning. Curriculum effectiveness should be measured by outcomes, not elements of desk time in school.

Schools need to evaluate differently what constitutes achievement of academic success. The traditional measure, the percentage of students who graduate from high school and go on to college is no longer the correct answer. Current demographic studies identify only 30 percent of available jobs require a 4 year college degree. Some futurists predict that this number will diminish to 20 percent in the 21st Century. The United States is the only industrialized country in the world that does not have a focused school-to-work transition program to train the 70 to 80 percent of those students who will enter the work force directly out of high school. Isolated programs like Jobs for Vermont Graduates develop job related work skills for at-risk students in the 13 Vermont high schools. This program affects less than 1 percent of all high school students. ESEA funding could play an instrumental role in helping educators investigate exemplary school-to-work models like those found in Germany and Denmark. The creation of long-term apprenticeships is but one example of effective programs that integrate academic work and authentic work-related experiences. The collaborative relationship that Secretaries Riley and Reich are developing between labor and education model the importance of preparing students for an ever-changing world. President Clinton reinforced this notion when he said, "We all have to work together, business and government, labor and educators, to make things happen." These are the type of programs I believe he was alluding to.

Many businesses and communities realize that school bashing is not an effective solution to the problem of students graduating or dropping out, who do not have the skills that will enable them to be successful workers and productive members of society. 58,000 adults over 18 are categorized as functional illiterate; 77,000 adults over 18 have not received a high school diploma in Vermont. Schools and communities were not able to match these—were not able to match these students' needs with the traditional requirements of the educational institution. Many communities are working to change these statistics by utilizing learning style research and by connecting community resource services like those previously funded by ESEA funding. The philosophy that it takes a community to raise a child gives credence to the argument that the school is not the only stakeholder in a child's success. I recommend your committee continue to fund programs that provide equalized opportunities for all students and promote the attainment of literacy by all adults in the State of Vermont by the year 2000.

In summary, students face a very different world and menu of educational opportunities today than when ESEA was developed in 1965. Preparing the world of work—preparing for the world of work is one part of a set of coordinated learning experiences for each student. School curriculum should be designed to integrate with all disciplines and provide age and developmentally appropriate experiences for all students. The curriculum should be balanced between the effective psychomotor and cognitive domains and reflect the importance of valuing, creating ideas, accomplishing—and accomplishment and good work.

The most effective strategies for ESEA funding will be to support school restructuring by providing flexibility in funding, funding linked to achieved outcomes, and support and technical assistance

for schools that incorporate an integrated community education concept.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you. Excellent statement.

Noreen.

Ms. O'CONNOR. Thank you, Senator, for inviting me to testify this morning.

I represent the Vermont Council on Vocational-Technical Education. That is a council that is present in every State in the union. It is appointed by either the governor or in some cases the Commissioner of Education if he or she is elected. It is made up of seven people from the private sector, six from the public sector. It covers agriculture, labor organizations, small businesses, large businesses, guidance counselors, and representatives of special populations, and the mission of the council is to evaluate the vocational-technical system in the State both at the secondary and postsecondary level and to advise the governor, and the State board and our legislators on moves that might improve both the education for the students and ways to improve our economic development functions of the State. We also have a special concern for special populations, and that would be children with disabilities, adults with disabilities, single parents, veterans and people in the correctional system.

I would like to just thank Winton for that great wrap-up of where we are in our educational system and a more frightening figure. We are running a system, it does appear which we just evaluate on college placements, and a recent evaluation by the Office of Budget & Management pointed out that of all of the students who begin 4 year college programs, only 12 percent of them complete. This is of college students, in 6 years. So we have some real myths exploding around out there about what our educational system is about and we do need to change our emphasis.

I am going to be fairly boring, I think, this morning and speak specifically to ways of incorporating the integration of academic and vocational education into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The latest reauthorization of the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act—that is the act that emphasizes voc-tech system—emphasizes the need to better prepare today's students to compete in a technologically advanced global work force by developing more fully both their occupational and academic skills. Congress determined that one way this goal could be accomplished is by focusing funds on improving education programs through the integration of vocational and academic curriculum.

Integration involves changing both the vocational and academic courses and then coordinating them in a cohesive program. Vocational and academic instructors would work together to, one, teach fundamental academic concepts initially in academic courses in an applied way that shows the value of learning to students and; two, apply and reinforce the academic competencies in vocational programs.

In order for the integration of academic and vocational education to be fully effective, it must receive the same priority status on the academic side of the equation as it does on the vocational side of the equation. Congress can reinforce its commitment to the integration of academic and vocational pedagogical strategy, particularly

for special populations, by coordinating its intent in the Perkins Act with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In particular, the following elements required for effective integration should be addressed in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act or ESEA. One, the importance of the integration of academic and vocational education should be acknowledged in the ESEA, both with explicit statements and eligibility for funding. This action would legitimize the integration of academic and vocational education outside the Perkins Act where the onus seems to fall right now. And for those of you who are not familiar with voced, students do not come into the vocational-technical system until the eleventh grade. And for many people it is still perceived as a place for kids who don't, "learn by book learning but learn by hands on." And as you heard Winton say, and you probably know, that many of our technical programs today are far more sophisticated than they were even 10 years ago.

Teachers and administrators must be at the core of this reform movement. Incentives should be provided to encourage academic and vocational teachers and administrators to participate in integration efforts. Professional development is required to develop the expertise to effectively integrate academic and vocational competencies. Just purchasing applied curriculum does not solve the concerns surrounding this integration effort. And I would re-emphasize what Molly Burke said earlier about it being a process and not just a quick reign. That was a great expression that you used.

One of the goals of integrating academic and vocational education, as stated in the Perkins Act, is to ensure that students achieve both academic and occupational competencies. Most academic teachers are not accustomed to identifying competencies. Resources and technical assistance are needed to help identify those for those teachers.

An essential component of an effective integration program is a consolidated career guidance system beginning at the elementary level and continuing through high school. Youth must be made aware of the range of careers and the specific occupations available to them. They also need to understand the importance of schooling to their future, whether they plan to go into the work force after high school or go to college.

Special emphasis needs to be placed on the career planning for girls and young women. The recent study, Shortchanging Girls: Shortchanging America, sponsored by the American Association of University Women points out the still present inequities in our school systems. An aggressive campaign to eliminate gender bias and sexual harassment in our schools needs to be integrated throughout the educational system. And I would add from personal experience that this is particularly relevant when it comes to poor girls. And the relationship between girls who have not been made aware of career opportunities and the reality of their working lives are more vulnerable than ever to fall on to the need for welfare assistance. And it has an effect on their children. Someone mentioned before earlier that if you educate a parent, you educate a family, and that is something I certainly learned years ago from the Sisters of Mercy; that if you educate a mother, you educate a family.

And I really emphasize that need that girls really need some special attention.

Teachers and administrators are indicating tremendous success with efforts to articulate programs from secondary to postsecondary levels through occupational education courses. These programs under the title of Tech-Prep are a natural pathway to move the occupational educators into contact with their academic counterparts in the postsecondary system. Consideration should be given in the ESEA reauthorization to provide resources to make that pathway effectively include the academic teachers prior to students entering the vocational system. So it would be an articulation from the high school, to the voc center, then onto postsecondary. And we need some kind of a systemic way to do that. I have some very specific recommendations.

First, give priority for the use of Chapter 1 funds and the Local Targeted Assistant program funds to programs that teach academics in an applied and experiential manner and integrate academic and vocational courses. The American Vocational Association has proposed language of this effort to be incorporated throughout the act under the basic program requirements for school-wide projects, for Basic Skills Improvement and Dropout Prevention programs and for programs for handicapped children.

Specify the Chapter 1 funds and Local Targeted Assistance program funds may be used for technical assistance and training for applied teaching methods and the integration of academic and vocational competencies; release time or stipends to enable academic and occupational teachers to work together to develop curriculum and instructional materials and/or coordinated courses to integrate academic and voc-ed; travel and fees for academic, and voc teachers and administrators to attend conferences and workshops on the integration of academic and vocational education and to observe innovative pilot projects.

Three, under Chapter 2, Part B, the National Programs and Activities, establish a national program of contracts and grants to assist states in identifying academic competencies which are career oriented and relate directly to the workplace.

And, four, specify the Chapter 1 Basic Program Funds, School-wide Projects Funds, Basic Skill Improvement program funds and Local Targeted Assistance program funds may be used for career guidance and counseling activities or projects which make students aware of the connection of academics to the world of work, including career introduction and exploration courses.

And I just would finally like to say that I have been an elementary ed teacher, a Special Ed teacher and a voc-ed teacher and having the years of experience and observing the way students are turned on when they are in a vocational-technical setting, and learning through applied methods and seeing the success that they have, it makes me want to see more children get that opportunity at a much earlier age. And I think that would address Goal 2 of the National Goals in dropout prevention. I think it would just make kids tune into school at a much earlier age and realize the need for lifelong learning.

And one last thought as we look at school work transitions. There is a lot of talk right now about youth apprenticeship pro-

grams and there is some talk about starting a new system, and I think that given our limited resources and the need to stretch our dollar and have the best bang for the buck, what I would like to see is that the—we emphasize the good aspects of the vocational-technical program, coordinate it better with the academic side and link the youth apprenticeship program into that system, and keep the responsibility for children in the Department of Education both at the national and State level. And I have to say that I just did return from a trip to Cologne, Germany, where I was on an educational exchange and did observe their voc-tech system and their apprenticeship program up close. And although they don't do everything perfectly, they do some things very, very well. And I think that we really need to look at that—their system for keeping the vocational education link to youth apprenticeship. It is not in a separate system. And on that, thank you for the this opportunity.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you. Maxine, I would like to inquire a little bit more what you mean by choice. Are you talking about maybe schools have different expertises so you could select or you just——

Ms. BRANDENBERG. Well, that is one possibility, obviously, you know. And we have now areas where there are several—schools certainly that are within 10 or 15 mile radiuses and there may be a decision that some schools may emphasize certain kinds of programs or specializations. You also may see the development of new alternative private schools. In some states they've developed charter schools, which is sort of a sort of a combination of the public private kind of school. It takes people who are in a public school and gives them an opportunity to charter a new kind of school. So I think there are many approaches. The Roundtable put together a report that we put out that lays out an approach to how we might implement it in Vermont.

Senator JEFFORDS. Are you talking elementary——

Ms. BRANDENBERG. K-12.

Senator JEFFORDS. —or just secondary?

Ms. BRANDENBERG. K-12.

Senator JEFFORDS. K-12. This is one for all of you. What is the business community doing to coordinate with the school systems to design curricula? That was mentioned. What is going on?

Mr. GOODRICH. I'll jump on that one. One of our goals is to work with the University of Vermont and the School Development Institute as a place where teams of teachers come together. One of the themes that is occurring in many of these SDI programs this summer focuses on community. And in our insight we feel that business and education partnerships fit very nicely in the community theme. We are offering graduate credit and also specialized workshops to actually help educators go into business, to experience what the expectations are and then to carry that back into the classroom with redrafted, recrafted curriculum that students next fall and next year would have an opportunity to experience up front.

Senator JEFFORDS. Noreen, you mentioned the Cologne, Germany—since I have been over and taking a look at it too. Over there though there is a real strong linkage and long-time stability in families and workers. Do you think it would work over here? I

know we are trying in the southern part of the State with some linkages, but are there that many jobs created that you can meaningfully try to relate to local businesses?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Well, you struck a real core. The Cologne, German, apprenticeship system is built on a guild system and it has a very rich tradition. What I realized in visiting, it has 12 million people and you've got a critical mass of people. They were very clear in saying they had only apprenticeships and vocational systems tied where the jobs were. They have a huge automotive program there. Ford has the apprenticeship program there. The business commitment to apprenticeship and their payback to the community is extremely strong. I mean, they talk about it in very lofty, idealistic terms. I don't know how well it will work in a small, rural State. I think there are some very exciting possibilities, particularly in the more esoteric emerging technology fields where we can't possibly put together programs for all of those fields such as biotech or the emerging technologies whether it comes to waste management, environmental things. So I think there are some real opportunities to put together some very interesting apprenticeship programs, but my concern is that it be tied very closely to a system that is already in place and is working. And as you well know, Senator, because you are one of our greatest allies, voc-ed has always had a very tight connection to the business community in that every program has had a technical committee advising it on everything on curriculum, on buying equipment, and it is worked well. So my concern is that we keep a tie to that kind of a system rather than start something very new and experiment with our children. I have seen too many programs, as you pointed out yourself, get started and then sort of when they were no longer new and sexy, get dumped. I am really concerned about this being sustained and we not take chances with our children's education.

Senator JEFFORDS. I would just comment though that we've had for at least 10 years now trying to get the voc-ed program to become more related to the work force needs, and at least until recently it hasn't done that. So I don't want to leave you with the feeling that I think that there isn't change needed in the vocational educational training and the ability to try and attract students to put them on a track which will get them into a meaningful job rather than the present—rather than the just floating around system.

Ms. O'CONNOR. Well, I think right now if you check our statistics in Vermont, 95 percent of children have positive placements at the end of their voc-ed experience. Forty percent of them go on to some kind of postsecondary experience, and most of them complete out of that group. So I think there are some myths still floating around out there about voc-ed. And I think when it comes to secondary systems that are trying very hard to be innovative, you'll see more innovation in the vocational-technical systems than in some other places because they are school of choice. Students don't have to be there.

Senator JEFFORDS. Maxine, how important is education reform to this country right now and to Vermont?

Ms. BRANDENBERG. Well, I think it is absolutely critical. I mean, as far as we are concerned, the other major area the Roundtable

is looking at is economic development and competitive strategy for Vermont, and you can't separate education from that. I mean, that is absolutely the underpinning. It is absolutely critical. The work we are doing now looking at the economy, at core, who our competitors are, and where the growth sectors are going to be and how we design a policy in Vermont to be effective in terms of creating a jobs for our future quality of life all hinges on education because the intellectual value, so to speak, kinds of jobs that are coming, people are going to need higher levels skill. There is no question about it, and we must have that link. I mean, that is why we are so concerned that although we've had, I think, excellent leadership in this State in education, I think we have a terrific State board and we have some schools that have done wonderful things, but there are pockets that it is not consistent and it is not moving fast enough. And that is why we are advocating some of these rather controversial measures because we see sort of the internal change, but we think we need some external marketing forces and some more pressure to accelerate it because we can't afford to wait for the sake of our children.

Senator JEFFORDS. Winton.

Mr. GOODRICH. I wouldn't have a lot more to say about that other than I think it is very important that we get out of content teaching and into conceptual mode. And I say that linking to the Common Core of Learning and the SCANS report, that it needs to shift into outcomes as opposed to students sitting and listening for a prescribed amount of time. Students need to be active learners. I think that schools that promote that—and that is a lot of what Noreen is saying through vocational centers, active learning—really deals with the multiple intelligences and learning style research supporting a lot of the dramatic change happening in schools. So that would be my response to that issue. Absolutely essential. And especially in light of 50 percent of the jobs that are predicted to be coming available in the future have not been invented yet. We've really got to have our act together educationally for students to be able to respond to change, to deal with people, to work as team members. The process of information and technology is essential.

Senator JEFFORDS. How essential is it to be also oriented toward the change in life job situation as far as business is concerned? In other words, the ability for people to receive training for new types of jobs and how is Vermont measuring up to meeting that need?

Ms. O'CONNOR. Well, I can speak that right now we have about 4,000 adults in the vocational centers on a space-available basis. That means that if a class is not completely filled, the Vermonter even with a high school diploma can go back to school and get additional training, and those slots are just in great demand. And sadly in this last legislative go around that our State moneys to accommodate that was cut out of the budget. So although we talk a great deal about this need for ongoing adult education, training and retraining, our public policy would say something else. And I am very, very concerned about that. I think that we need to have places for adults to come back to school. We need to have things like child care available and transportation available. And I think small businesses in this State can't do it alone. They need to work in tandem with the existing systems, and we need to be very re-

sponsive to their needs as well. I think we also need to remember that the business community is spending an extraordinary amount on this as well. As one of our interests, we did a survey 3 years ago of how much, not so much retraining, but basic skills training was going on. So we have a very big interest in this. I think the other thing is that as we put children through the education system, we need to keep reminding them constantly that education is a lifelong activity; that they not leave school with a notion, now I am done, I can go to work and good-bye school but, rather, this is just the beginning. And I think we have a lot of adults who are discovering this now, but I think it is very important to create that mindset in our children for the future.

Mr. GOODRICH. One short comment on that. I attended recently the Jobs for the Future Apprenticeships Conference in Maine, which a lot of states identified the models they were following and, again, I refer to the German model and the Danish model; that once students finish high school, there is additional direct training through either community college or technical schools that are part of an expanded high school experience, and it leads to a Certificate of Advanced Mastery, leads to a lot of areas where there are outcomes linked to learning. And I think that is a changing paradigm that we really need to look at that to help students. That is not as Maxine said, the end all. Educational experience, that continues as a lifelong emphasis.

Senator JEFFORDS. Well, thank you all of you for very excellent presentation in this very important area which is critical, as we all know, to the future of the country, especially in Vermont, which needs your support. Thank you. We are going to take another 5-minute break and then we will be right back.

(Recess.)

Senator JEFFORDS. If the 5th panel would come forward now, I would appreciate it. They are Jan Willey, Addison Northeast Supervisory Union; Vicki Hornus from the Burlington School District, director of special education; Susan James the Windham Southeast Supervisory Union; and David Switz, principal of Readsboro Elementary School; and Billy Wheeler, Readsboro resident and Chapter 1 parent; and Marianne Miller, director of the Central Vermont Head Start. I will say in the interim as we await the panel to be seated, that we will try to break right around 12:30, though this is a good panel and I am not going to cut them short. And one hour after that we will come back for the afternoon session, and at that time we will have available a microphone for anyone who is here as a private citizen or in a special capacity to be able to tell me their concerns and hopefully have some solutions to problems. I would be happy to listen. And I'll be here as long as there are people desiring to do so, at least for a reasonable length of time, and we will see. But I look forward to that part. It is always a very interesting part of our hearing sessions. But with that, I'll turn to this panel and, Jan, I'll ask you to start and we will go in order of the names on the schedule here.

STATEMENTS OF JAN WILLEY, ADDISON NORTHEAST SUPERVISORY UNION, MONKTON, VT; VICKI HORNUS, BURLINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT, DIRECTOR OF SPECIAL EDUCATION; SUSAN JAMES, WINDHAM SOUTHEAST SUPERVISORY UNION; DAVID SWITZ, PRINCIPAL, READSBORO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL; BILLY WHEELER, READSBORO RESIDENT AND CHAPTER 1 PARENT; AND MARIANNE MILLER, DIRECTOR, CENTRAL VERMONT HEAD START

Ms. WILLEY. Last but not least. I think this group really says it. Thank you, Senator, for inviting me to testify today, and I am here representing the Addison Northeast Supervisory Union. And for those of you in the room who may not know where that is, it is down on Route 7 the Towns of Bristol, Lincoln, Monkton, Starksboro, and New Haven. So we are cousins to Chittenden County actually.

My themes have really been stated by others, but I am going to just briefly let you know what they are and then I would like you to leave with an idea of sort of what's happening in my own school district around these themes. And I really thank you for your support. I have been kicking around in education in Vermont for a quarter of a century and plan to be here for the next 25 years and hope that you are too.

Concepts that are very important to me when you are looking at the reauthorization of ESEA are, without doubt, flexibility but still with accountability. And accountability not just in the sense of standardized achievement tests. I am really hoping that the focus will sort of go off that kind of an assessment measure. I am sort of a believer in authentic assessment, and I think that Chapter 1 fits into that beautifully. We've done a lot of work with that in our district, and actually two teachers and myself presented it at a conference in Texas around authentic assessment and the Chapter 1 student. Also professional development is something that many panelists have stressed today, and I think it is critical. I think that a Chapter 1 program is only as good as the school in which it is, and I think that we need to retool not only teachers but administrators in what's current.

We need to prepare our kids better for the next century. Parent involvement is a piece that is been a definite strength of the Chapter 1 requirements, and we've used it in our district to really make a lot of changes. We had a parent meeting last week, two of our towns, Bristol and Lincoln, and 110 people showed up. And we really do look at parent involvement as a process, not an event. We don't hold an annual meeting where we invite parents to hear about Chapter 1; we let them know that in other ways throughout the year. We've really involved parents in ways they are able to share in their student's learning, they are able to see their student work, they come together in a social event, and for the past 7 years it is been a very successful happening. I also want to say that our district was one of the original sites for—well, to be granted a Challenge grant award of $10,000 back in 1990, and we are the only site in the State that approached this as a district. So we have gotten a lot of mileage out of $30,000 that we've received from the State of Vermont over the past 3 years.

One of our goals has really been to diminish the effect of one's socioeconomic level on school achievement. And, as you know, most of the Chapter 1 students whom we serve really fall in that category. I am happy to say that we are able, particularly in the area of science, to diminish that. If you came in and took a loot at our kids, you couldn't tell whether you looked at a CTBS score or our own authentic measures. So I am really happy to report that and stress to you the importance of authentic assessment.

I also am here representing 17 members of the State Advisory Council of Chapter 1, and they wanted me to share with you also their belief in this flexibility with accountability as being critical to this reauthorization process. Also the nature of the program improvement part of our Chapter 1 requirements, I guess as the regulations now State, a school has 1 year to demonstrate that some progress has been made or considerable progress has been made toward that goal. And as we know from reading authors like Michael Fullan, the change process doesn't happen after 1 year; it is a three to five-year process. And I would urge you to support that concept when looking at school improvement for Chapter 1 programs.

I am realizing that there really is a need to be brief, and I have covered my areas but would certainly be open to any questions that you might have of me.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you, Jan.

Vicki.

Ms. HORNUS. Thank you, Senator Jeffords, for this opportunity to give you my perspective on some of the programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. My colleagues in the Burlington school district and I really appreciate your willingness to hear from us as you prepare for the reauthorization.

I first want to say that I suspect everyone in this room acknowledges that Vermont is a special place to live and work. We are fortunate that most of Vermont continues to have a sense of community and a willingness to reach out to all members of the community. In our city of Burlington it is becoming harder and harder to retain that sense of community and caring as we become more and more of a real but smaller version of big city. A city with problems and challenges faced by the larger cities across our country, the challenges of poverty, homelessness, crime, racial tension, language barriers, bigotry and misunderstanding. We are hopeful, however, that as we work together, we can address these challenges and widen and strengthen our community. And our school district is certainly reaching out to the community and has actually initiated, I think, some collaborative efforts to do that.

We believe that our school system must address those challenges directly and with the entire community. Today though I need to focus on what we do and must continue to do within our school programs. It is there that the Chapter 1 program of ESEA has an enormous impact in Burlington. I want to comment about some of our experiences in our Chapter 1 programs, our programs for limited English students or who are currently called English language learners, but the term seems to change monthly; and small grants that we have for homeless children and youth. And I want to offer some suggestions for change or refinement, but first I want to tell you about some of our Chapter 1 programs. Most people have been

talking about more conceptual things, and I want to bring this back to what's happening day to day in our schools.

Certainly our Chapter 1 program no longer resembles the typical program of a few years ago where it was a pull-out model. Our Chapter 1 program works much more closely with and in collaboration and support of the so-called regular classroom program or curriculum. Over the last few years our Chapter 1 teachers in Burlington have become team teachers and have provided support and expertise on how classroom teachers can more successfully address the various needs and great variety of students within their classes. They've provided extra support for eligible Chapter 1 students within the classroom rather than out so that the students do not have to leave, do not have to miss something in their class while they are out, and do not end up with instruction and activities that are significantly different from what's going on in the classroom. They have become, the Chapter 1 teachers, accepted as real and valuable faculty members in their schools and not teachers that are sometimes or were sometimes perceived as having the luxury of working with a few students in a room down the hall. I have seen great professional development among those Chapter 1 teachers in the past few years.

Thanks to some of the options within the Federal guidelines we have two alternative or replacement programs in our schools which serve at-risk students at both the middle and high school level. We have an early education program which began this year and serves about 30 children and families in the old North End of Burlington, we have a summer program which combines work in a computer lab with intensive work in reading and writing. We have an after school program which takes underachieving and unconnected middle school students into the community. We have an after school program for parents and their children to work on computers. We have booklets of summer activities that are sent home with elementary school students. We have a Chapter 1 handbook for parents that gives ideas of how they can support schools efforts at home, and we even have a very small but successful program run by a volunteer with a budget of $100 which uses cooking and the French language to expand the cultural experiences of children. This is in one of our schools with the highest poverty rate, and this program is in its second year and I expect we will continue.

I tell you about these programs and activities to let you know that we really are always trying to improve and expand the support and experiences that we provide for our students and to ask you to keep these kinds of options available to students within the Federal Chapter 1 program.

One of the changes in the Chapter 1 requirements since the last reauthorization is program improvement. As some of our Chapter 1 teachers who are here today would testify, we did not welcome this with open arms. And while we still believe that the bureaucracy of it is more than it needs to be and the measurement that is used to judge the need for program improvement is ludicrous, we will be the first to admit that it has forced us into some intensive and comprehensive planning for changes in our schools. Changes which we believe will address issues and problems in a more systemic way rather than in a child-specific fashion. One of our

schools, Barnes Elementary, expects to adopt a school wide program model next year. Another, Wheeler Elementary, is embarking on the implementation of the accelerated schools model. The results have been positive, but to judge whether a school's program is effective by looking at the composite gain on SAT or other standardized tests makes no sense. At least in our district we believe that the scores are significantly influenced by other factors, not the least of which is that only those students who happen to have a pre and post test have their gain or loss considered. For a city like Burlington with a great deal of transience in some off our schools, not a lot of students have two test opportunities.

I have describe what I consider to be important and we hope effective features of our Chapter 1 program. However, I have to wonder if at the same time that we are attempting to solve some of the problems we aren't creating new ones. As I understand Chapter 1, the basic philosophy requires that we identify the eligible students and provide additional support for them. We must document that identification and provision of services and measurement of effectiveness in a proscribed fashion. My concern is while our heartfelt intentions are to redirect students who are educationally disadvantaged and give them advantages, we may sabotage our efforts by creating the Chapter 1 student, and not only the Chapter 1 student but the Chapter 1 parent. Our regulations require us to single out the eligible students and parents and do something different, something supplemental. I know I disagree with some of the earlier speakers on this. I worry that we create sort of a reverse halo effect, that we reinforce in all of our minds that this is a group of folks who are really quite different, not as able and for whom the expectations must be adjusted downward.

Some of the information which your office sent us prior to this hearing listed this as a concern as well. I certainly don't have the answers for how to ensure systemic changes in our school systems, but I do have a few suggestions and, again, some are consistent with earlier speakers and some are not.

The first is to get superintendents involved in Chapter 1. They need to understand it and to view it as a tool to improve the educational opportunities for all students in their schools. Next, put greater emphasis on school-wide projects. Encourage summer planning time, perhaps with compensation, for teachers and school staff in preparing and planning for those projects. Next, require that funds be spent on staff development for all staff, not just Chapter 1 staff, to improve the understanding of student needs and the repertoire of teachers and others to address those needs. Have staff development and curriculum directors who are connected with Chapter 1 programs. Have Chapter 1 parent involvement focused on all parents with extra efforts to reach out to the parents of the educationally disadvantaged but not singling them out as a group. Expect State department staff to have a much stronger role in staff development, and program development and support rather than monitoring and compliance. Demonstrate that reading and math remediation is not the only way. Another suggestion, to allow and encourage Chapter 1 funds to be used for teens and young adults who may have opted out of school but who are headed toward parenthood of another generation of disadvantaged children. Another,

use the resources in the technical assistance centers across the country to develop alternative ways to assess the success of Chapter 1 programs. Another, change the auditing and compliance requirements to match the innovative program efforts that are already being encouraged but don't seem to have reached the Federal compliance monitors or the auditing guide for the—those who conduct the single audit. You can tell I even get nervous talking about auditors. And, last, to explore the efforts of incorporating funding for limited English students into Chapter 1.

While some of the program needs for these students are quite specific, they also represent an educationally disadvantaged group. For example, currently in our district we have about 180 students whose native language is other than English. 140 of these students receive English as a second language support. For the current school year our district spent over $125,000 of local money for direct instruction in ESL for these students above their normal program. That does not include administrative support from my office or from anyplace else in the district. This year we received a Federal grant of $6,000. The grant is a bonus in that we are using it for staff development and the acquisition of additional materials; however, because this was a particularly interesting new grant, it cost, I would figure, about $1,000 of various staff members' time in the State and local district. Perhaps Federal support for limited English students could appropriately be connected to Chapter 1 funding.

I recognize that the current guidelines allow for some of these things to occur now, but I believe there needs to be an increased emphasis on them. Every time I hear Mary Jean Letendre speak about the possibilities in Chapter 1, I am encouraged, energized and ready to move on it. But too often her words are followed very soon by reams of new regulations and documentation requirements that simply don't fit with what Mary Jean encouraged us to do. It is as though there is a cadre of elves at work somewhere between Mary Jean and us whose sole purpose is to generate regulations for the sake of regulations.

Again, we thank you for this opportunity, and we encourage you to maintain flexibility and options in service delivery and Chapter 1, to continue emphasis on school-wide changes which have positive effects on the achievement of all students, to continue to encourage the integration of Chapter 1 efforts with the regular curriculum, to retain innovative program options and to revisit the program improvement system.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you.

Susan.

Ms. JAMES. Thanks very much for having the opportunity to talk today. One of the best benefits for me has been able to hear what everybody else has to say. It is remarkable, you are going to think we all got together and planned this, but I agree with, not everything, but a lot of what has been said here today. I would like to begin just with some general comments, somewhat philosophical, and then I have some very specific comments.

I have been involved in education for 25 years, regular, and Special Ed and Chapter 1 and I have got two very different feelings right now. One is that I have never been more concerned about the

health of our society. We are a culture in sincere risk of really failing over the next half century, and at the same time I have never been more encouraged about the good ideas that are out there in education and the linking of education to business and our communities for the first time in 25 years. It is really quite promising. We are talking about the same things for once.

I live and work in one of Vermont's largest school districts, though not large by most States. The Brattleboro area is a wonderful place to live and it is a wonderful place to raise children. It is full of all sorts of cultural and recreational opportunities. By most standards we have a strong school system and staffed by dedicated and knowledgeable professionals. People come to Brattleboro also because we have a diversified economy and we have—it may be the lowest unemployment rate in the State right now. According to State funding formulas we will within about a year and a half get no State funding at all with Burlington.

We are, however, one of a handful of Vermont districts receiving a significant increase in Chapter 1 funds. That is a little contradictory, isn't it? Chapter 1 funding is based on something that is far more important than property values, it is based on poverty rates. Listen to what our children are telling us. Brattleboro's poverty rate in children ages five to eight increased 20 percent between 1980 and 1990. The recession hit us after 1990. So we know it has to be significantly more than a 20 percent increase since then. In a town where the State formula was—the State formula says is rich, 41 percent of our children receive free and reduced lunches this year. Those are the people who can fill out the papers. We know there are many people out there who should be getting it who can't get their way through the papers. These figures have steadily worsened over the last 10 years. Listen to what our children are telling us. We are not isolated. This is all over the country. They are our future, and they deserve far better than this.

I propose that for the next 5 years Congress remove all Chapter 1 regulations except one. Chapter 1 programs must significantly improve learning of our neediest students. If during this five-year period we cannot demonstrate that Chapter 1 can significantly improve learning of the students most at risk of failure, then Congress should impose new regulations.

Chapter 1 has provided 25 years of narrowly defined supplementary instruction, but results have not been as dramatic as we hoped. And now we are losing ground with these students and their families. Their growing needs are complex. Solutions require integrated services from schools, and community and government resources. Chapter 1 needs to be one of several partners in this effort. We have no choice. We can't tinker and fine tune anymore. The future of the culture really depends on some deep, systemic, integrated change.

Free us from regulations which drain precious instructional time. Chapter 1 is becoming, like some other programs, regulation bound. When this happens more attention goes to compliance than to instruction and children are the losers. The regulations perpetuate systems which no longer work, which create expensive compliance procedures and neglect children.

Free us from regulations, but hold us accountable for meeting standards and improving learning of the neediest students. Eliminate standardized testing for Chapter 1 pre and post testing. It does not measure what our students know. Standardized testing restricts instruction for at-risk students. We need to teach them to apply skills and concepts to practical daily situations. Assessment should occur within this context. There is currently much happening in the field of performance assessment, which promises to be more effective for the at-risk students than standardized testing.

We have ideas about the direction we would like schools to take, but there are no recipes, no maps, no clear destinations. The growing needs of our children demand the committed and collaborative effort from all of us. Give State and local Chapter 1 programs the chance to work closely with regular and Special Education and community resources. Recognize that the needs of rural children are serious and growing. We cannot afford to lose Chapter 1 support because our population is small.

Listen to what our children are telling us in Vermont, and Massachusetts, and California, and Illinois, and every other State. They are our future, and we are seriously neglecting them.

Now I would like to have just a few nuts and bolts comments. Parent involvement, I agree with, is critically important. The average teacher on a good day has 13 percent of his or her day that is nonstudent time. We have to be practical about what can be done with the rest of that time. And all of the school improvement, parent contact and collaboration that goes on has to go on within that 13 percent. We have to be spending our time on parent involvement efforts that truly make a difference for children. Some of the present regulations of—involving parent involvement don't directly affect children, and parents, we have found, are not particularly interested in. We want to be able to spend our time with parents who—and because parents want to know, how can we help our own children, how can we work with you? They are really not interested particularly in policy, and they are having such a hard time we can't even get them out to workshops. We used to be able to do that, and we can't do that anymore. We'd rather put our efforts in the limited time we have on things that really make a difference for their children. A rural State like Vermont, most of us can't afford to hire a parent involvement person. We don't have dedicated personnel, so it is existing personnel. Some of the regulations have us spending times on aspects of parent involvement that really don't affect the kids.

School choice. I just—I am no expert on school choice, but my feeling is if what we are trying to do is affect school improvement, then why not work directly on school improvement and staff development. School choice in and of itself does not improve schools; it is the resulting staff development and school improvement efforts that improves the school. So why not work directly on that.

I have a little bit of experience with school—the program improvement and, again, I want to underscore, right now the guidelines don't give us enough time to make serious improvement. We can't—we can't be isolated from overall school improvement. So program improvement efforts need to be integrated with school improvement and we just—I just as a precautionary note, don't con-

fuse school improvement plans with school improvement. We are all very good at writing plans, and our biggest weakness in education is not implementing them.

Just a brief underscoring of Even Start. We have one of the original Even Start grants and we just got word that we are one of the two recipients in Vermont. We've had a lot of experience in the Brattleboro area with early education. We have some serious data now showing that it, indeed, does set children up for improved learning when they start school. We are showing good results. Even Start is showing good results especially when coupled with Reading Recovery. Yesterday I confirmed to the Chapter 1 teacher for a child who came to our early ed programs and has now completed the Reading Recovery program. This child was about as high risk a 5 year old as we've ever seen. The child is reading at a fourth grade level. It is a little dramatic, but it shows what concentrated early intervention can do. There were 21 other applicants for the Even Start who got letters a couple of weeks ago saying they did not get the grants. Even Start needs to be much more levelly funded. It is very positive. It deals with literacy, which directly relates to school success, and those 21 applicants who the State did not fund deserve it as much as the two of us who did get funding. So it needs more funding.

The ESL, limited English students, is a growing need. Everyone in the State is going to be seeing increased population. We are the other corner of the State that has, at least for us, a sizable population, but we have about 12 languages and it is scattered throughout five towns in our district. Some of the funding is not really available to us because we don't have bilingual programs. We don't need them right now, but we need funding that will help us increase training to classroom teachers and specialists, to hire teachers, and materials and electronic equipment. And this population is going to steadily increase throughout the whole State.

I just have one more thing I would like to end on and that is that I am sure that Congress is aware of the demographic information that is coming out. The next 25 years is going to be much different economically, and from the standpoint of the kinds of children we are going to be educating and the needs are going to be great. It is not going to be like anything we've ever had before. The demographic information is really critical that we all start reading it and looking at it so we can do some long-term planning.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you, Susan.

David.

Mr. SWITZ. Thanks for having me also, and the majority of the information and comments in my testimony, Senator, has been based on my 22 years of experience as a classroom teacher in a small rural school in southern Vermont. During the last 7 of these years I have split my duties as teaching principal. My mornings are focused with 23 fourth and fifth graders while the afternoon is finding out about the school, performing my principal duties.

Your communication expressed a desire for testimony to focus on how to improve the Federal role in education, and I have to admit that my knowledge of the big picture and the inner workings of the Federal government is limited. I don't know if that is good or bad. However, I am excited and pleased about what's happening in our

school, and I feel that there may be some merit in sharing this with you today.

Two years ago Readsboro School was invited to join with the State of Vermont in the Chapter 1 School Improvement Plan, and during that process of Chapter 1 improvement the Readsboro team was made aware of a model of literacy used in New Zealand schools and supported by their ministry of education. Our team became excited about their child centered approach to literacy, and with the help of Chapter 1 School Improvement grant we've begun to be trained in the model. And our training and implementation time line is outlined in a three-year plan. There is several components to the model and a belief system that focuses totally on the child. And two major aspects that I have seen work and believe can be effective in our educational system are, one, good first teaching and, two, ongoing teacher-centered development.

I am sure you are aware of the recent research attesting to the successes qualified teachers have achieved when they intensely instruct young students. Programs like Reading Recovery and Success by Six have received very positive reviews. One of our primary teachers in our small rural school was trained several years ago in Peers. This program uses Reading Recovery strategies and techniques. Since her training she has worked one on one with four students. A second grader who had shown signs in first grade of becoming a Chapter child is now performing very well without Chapter services. Two present first grade students participated in Peers this year and they have since been discontinued and are also doing well. Another child in a transitional first grade is likewise responding to this early intervention. These successes are directly related to an early, intensive level of involvement by a very dedicated, knowledgeable and well trained, experienced teacher who has worked with these students before school and at her lunchtime.

On a national level, if more of our at-risk students could be provided this type of intervention, I believe that we would experience a more literate society and maybe help to knock down some of those numbers that Mr. Goodrich mentioned. Meeting children at their respective levels of development and leading them on a continuum without attaching labels might very well enable children to meet with early success. That success would lead to continued success, and in the long run the money we now spend on remediation programs to assist at-risk students could be reduced or redirected.

The Federal Government could have assistance in the area of teacher development and training. This year several of our teachers have been involved with ongoing training in the New Zealand model facilitated by an outside expert. These teachers, myself included, identify what we value in readers, and writers and learning steps we will take to develop these values. We document the steps we will take with students and how we will know when we get there. During the coming year we will intensify our training with more outside facilitator days, perhaps 20, and the entire staff will be trained. Just as we work with our students with the child-centered philosophy, we will continue to work with the staff on a teacher-centered approach. I feel that an accepted philosophy that looks at teacher development as an ongoing teacher-centered process would be very powerful.

As I reflect on our work this year and on my readings and discussions over the years, I wonder if our country might benefit from formulating a national philosophy instead of beliefs which reflect child-center approaches to learning. Why can't we all agree on what we value and respect in learners and learning and direct our efforts toward realizing our beliefs? Can you imagine the effectiveness teacher training and development would lead to when they are tied to what everyone believes in in values? For example, if we all agree that good first teaching is important and that early intervention by qualified personnel is important to developing our learners who may have tangles, doesn't it make sense to devote some resources to the professional development of teachers in these areas?

I have attempted to be concise hitting on areas I feel would improve education. If the Federal government were to direct resources into the areas of good first teaching, ongoing professional development and a national philosophy instead of beliefs, I believe our students would reap the enormous benefits. Thanks.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you, David.

Billy.

Mr. WHEELER. Once again, thank you for inviting me here today. I am going to speak as a parent of a Chapter 1 student on early detection and parental involvement. I have two daughters, 11 year old sixth grader who has been a Chapter 1 student since third grade and I have an 8 year old daughter in second grade who had the potential of becoming a Chapter 1 student.

As far as early detection, at the end of my oldest daughter's second year of school the standardized testing showed a fall in certain areas going into third grade. It was recommended that she become a Chapter 1 student to help her gain on what may have been lost or what she may be losing in education. So it was agreed upon. My wife and I have always been involved in teacher-parent conferences, so we've kept track of our kids' education all the way. She's been in there for 3 years. What they—what is considered improvement is a—I don't know what they consider improvement, but she is maintaining a level of just behind some of the kids in her class. She hasn't succeeded to go up to her level. She hasn't gotten any further behind. I would like to see better improvement with one-on-one situations.

My youngest daughter who had the potential of becoming a Chapter 1 was detected much earlier. She is one of—well, she's in second grade now. David spoke of her as part of the Reading Recovery program. Her first grade teacher noticed right off quick that she may be running into troubles, talked to my wife and I, and we had agreed upon taking her—bringing her to school 45 minutes earlier a day ahead of all the other students for that one-on-one session with the teacher. And she has excelled to a point of going well above her reading—the reading ability of the other children in second grade, which was a definite plus to that early intervention, that one on one. Excellent—excellent outcome witn that.

As far as parental involvement, I have always been involved, my wife and I both, on a quarterly basis pretty much where we go in with our teacher-parent conferences. The one thing I would like to see from Chapter 1 is there has never been any one-on-one speak-

ing with the Chapter 1 teacher. Along with the report cards we get a little note saying they are improving or they need help in different areas. There has never been—there is never been contact to telling the parents how we can help. There is ways of—I found there is ways of actually drawing them back by trying to push too hard on certain elements. I learned a lot this last fall.

I was able to get to the National Conferences of Parents for Chapter 1 Title I Students and found that there are drawbacks. If you are not sure of what you are doing to help your kids, you are actually a hindrance. I would like to see more personal one-on-one conferences between Chapter 1 teachers and Chapter 1 parents so we can know how to help. A little report after every report card tells us that they are coming along or not coming along, but it doesn't tell us how to help.

It was not until year—I always took for granted that everything that should be done was being done in schools. Through the conferences—the national conferences I have learned that it is time to speak up, voice my opinion and find out what's going on. I shouldn't be sitting back waiting for them to come to me; I have to go to them. But through Chapter 1 I would like to see a little more contact between the Chapter 1 teachers and the parents.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you. That is very helpful. I'll be back to ask you a question when we finish.

Please proceed, Ms. Miller.

Ms. MILLER. Good afternoon. Again, thanks for giving us an opportunity to talk. I want to thank you for your continuing support for the Head Start program and for education.

I am the director of Central Vermont Head Start—I don't know if you can hear me—and I Chair the Vermont Head Start Association. I also Chair the Calais Vermont School Board. And I am the parent of an elementary school student and a toddler.

And, obviously, I am going to talk both about Head Start and the reauthorization of the ESEA, especially Chapter 1. It is very clear from my perspective that these programs should be supported, should be expanded and should be mandated to collaborate more closely.

Head Start has received a great deal of attention from the Bush and now from the Clinton administration. The President's economic stimulus package earlier this summer as well as his fiscal year 1994 budget proposal include substantial funding increases for Head Start and, consequently, has drawn a great deal of public attention to the program and with that some disturbing criticism. You know, it seems appropriate to share with you some of the information about how well Head Start is doing and how our six Vermont Head Start programs specifically perform. And I think that this bears with Chapter 1 and the sort of transition things we are talking about.

I wanted to clear up one sort of misconception that I heard earlier. Head Start is not any one model or any program. What Head Start has is a set of very detailed performance standards that are very wide and very comprehensive, and all Head Start programs must, all right, address them. They are minimums. How a community addresses them is very much a local option. So as one becomes familiar with Head Start, one sees dozens of permeations on how

programs are carried out. And I think that that is real important to understand because I think that speaks to some of the flexibility issues that I have heard echoed over and over again this morning.

In Vermont in 1991–92 Head Start programs served 1,071 children. 630 of these children were served through the home-based model that brings Head Start teachers into the child's home to enhance the parents' role as the primary educator of their children. 441 of those children were served through 23 classrooms spread the length and the width of our State. It is a very diverse program. My program has 230 children. We are scattered over a three-county area, so although we are the size of an elementary school—for example, we are in a 56-town area, which poses some unique challenges in terms of relating to other agencies and getting other agencies involved with us, our staff to child ratio is one to eight and a half in Vermont. The Children's Defense fund reports, based on the 1990 Census data, the stuff that was taken before the recession hit here, that Vermont Head Start programs now serve 41 percent of the eligible children. My sense is that we are actually serving less than that, that we may be serving 35 to 38 percent.

1,245 Head Start parents participate in Vermont programs as volunteers.

Senator JEFFORDS. How many?

Ms. MILLER. 1,245. Isn't that a wonderful number? In a collaborative project that my program operates with the Barre City Supervisory Union, our superintendent has commented frequently on the participation of parents in the classroom. At this site there are usually three to six parents working in the classroom along with our paid staff on a daily basis. And they are different parents. I think that this is the kind of involvement that we want in order to build a partnership between parents and educators at all levels, not just in Head Start, but also in the public schools. That is, I believe, the most critical factor to the success of our children. I don't think that education is just about children and teachers; I think if we leave parents and communities out of the formula that we will not achieve the lasting impacts that we all want.

98.5 percent of our Head Start children completed all medical screenings prescribed by Health and Human Services. 93.7 percent of them completed dental exams, many of them for the first time. 92.1 percent completed all the immunizations required for their age. Sixteen percent of our children were professionally diagnosed as having a disabling condition, and services were provided either directly through our program or in collaboration with the Essential Early Education programs. 95.5 percent of our families receive social services. In the very hard dimensions of Head Start, our Vermont programs are achieving well.

The most recent update of the renound Perry Preschool Study conducted by the High/Scope Foundation shows that now at age 27 children who were enrolled in the original group earned $5400 more than their controlled group peers, that 36 percent of the children who had preschool education now owned their home as compared to 13 percent of the control group, that 71 percent completed 12 or more years of education as opposed to 64 peers in the control group; bottom line, that for every dollar that was invested in children in that program, the return to taxpayers is now $7.16.

While no one has conducted an identical long-term study on Head Start, shorter term studies show that Head Start equips children to do better in school as they begin their elementary school careers. Children enrolled in Head Start have significant gains in cognitive test scores, socioemotional test scores and health status. Head Start children are less likely to be retained in grade or to be placed in Special Education classes. These effects demonstrate that regular Head Start programs achieve significant and lasting changes. Furthermore, many of the other benefits of Head Start such as the medical, dental and nutrition benefits, are preventative in nature and tended to be cumulative over time. Head Start also provides extensive parent education and parent involvement services and helps families form linkages with services in their community. And that is important in a State that has as high a degree of isolation as ours does.

The fade out of intellectual gains for Head Start programs and reported by John Hood recently was also found for the high school—High/Scope Perry program. Nevertheless, the children in the Perry Preschool program went on to achieve dramatic long-term, real-life outcomes, you know, as I just discussed, as well as significant improvements while they were students in school achievement, significantly lower high school dropout rates and significant reductions in arrests.

All of this is to say that despite the current wave of criticism that follows an increased interest in a program, Head Start is a quality program that has significant benefits for the children and families who participate and to the taxpayers who fund it. It is my strong belief that close collaboration with other programs, public and private, both public schools, as well as parent-child centers, and child care centers and child care providers is critical to supporting the families in nurturing their children. We are really all in it together.

My own sense, which is intuitive, is that research findings that Head Start children's cognitive gain—cognitive gains fade out by the third grade is actually a reflection of lack of continuing parent involvement in their educational process. I think that Chapter 1 services hold tremendous potential for continuing involvement of parents in public schools. And, again, it is my belief that that is the critical factor to the success of children. I once suggested to a Chapter 1 teacher to her dismay, and I am sure to the dismay of some here today, that we might get a better return on our Chapter 1 dollars if we applied them to working with parents so that the parents were better able to support their children than in providing direct services to the children, and I think that that is worth thinking about. There is been a great deal of discussion in the Vermont early education community around a publication titled, "It Takes a Village to Raise a Child." And as we talk about these collaborative efforts, I think that that is the approach that we are taking to. And within our own neighborhoods in that village we have learned to talk and communicate well, but I think that we are only beginning to master the skills of communicating with—between those neighborhoods, between the public schools, and the early childhood community, and with the business community and with all the other players that are critical to the success of children. I think that too

often schools have overlooked or underestimated the value of parents. And a teacher's life is very full. I have taught, and I know that it takes time to involve parents, and I know that it takes planning and that is not easily won. Head Start has a model of having staff who are specifically assigned to be parent involvement coordinators. And we have, because of our mandates, been able to structure the jobs of our teachers and our home visitors to include that as a priority. Now I understand that schools have different demands placed upon them.

I know that getting parents involved and keeping them involved is not easy. I know that it requires innovative methodology. Many parents work during the school day. Some parents do not have transportation, particularly—child care and transportation are often obstacles to evening meetings. Some parents have had poor experiences as students and are reluctant to engage as parents with a system that failed them as children. It is critical in these positions in our services to reach parents as well as children, and that means reaching out to parents at times when the parents are available and addressing the barriers that keep—prevent parents from participating. When Patricia Woodward from the Vermont PTA was speaking, it was all I could do to keep from leaping up and saying, right on, with the caveat that that level of parent involvement is not an add-on activity. It is not something that we can simply write in as an additional requirement on our grants. We need to look at our infrastructures and we need to look at the funding for the infrastructures and decide how serious we are about this because if that is a goal that we want to achieve, we have to pay for it.

Dr. Tim Nolan of the Institute for Innovation & Human Services in a paper that is titled, "What Makes Head Start Work," stresses the importance of what he characterizes as the soft dimensions of the Head Start program. He writes, and I quote, "If there is a single secret to Head Start success, it is this... the Head Start staff enters into a compassionate partnership with each Head Start parent to shape the future of their Head Start child." Dr. Nolan identifies the key factors that make this possible as trust. Head Start is trusted by low-income parents. Most of our parents and children come to us by word of mouth referral. Compassion. Nonpunitive nature. Head Start regulations do not allow us to suspend or to drop any child or parent for lack of participation, right; it is our mandate that we simply keep trying. Positive attitudes of Head Start staff. You know, we measure gains in a family and determine the family's values. Focus on the child, closeness to the customer.

Senator JEFFORDS. We are going to have to try and summarize. We will read—make your whole statement part of the record. We are running right through our lunchtime.

Ms. MILLER. OK. Let me cut back a little bit. You've heard about Success by Six. I think Success by Six in Vermont is important. I think it is important because it is brought public schools to the table with the early education community. I think it is important to keep doing that. I was recently at a national conference for the first time that included both Chapter 1, and Head Start and DOL youth employment and that we need to structure regulations and

Federal funding so that they encourage that crossing of what might otherwise be very disparate programs.

I think as a school board chair every year we are asked to authorize the use of our Chapter 1 money. Every year we end up applying it in our early grades and our primary grades, which is the right decision. I am always left with the feeling though that I am conducting a sort of educational triage; that I am putting the money where it is needed the most and where there are better chances for long-term recovery, but I wonder whether I am removing the support from other children that needed that to succeed. And I know that I don't have as a school board member the other supports to bring in. I hear middle school teachers talk about the difficulty of teaching their classes because of the widespread of student ability, and it causes me to fear and look at that Chapter 1 money.

Again, you know, at the bottom of this I wish we could get to a place in public policy where we could simply say children should have what they need and then talk about how we achieve that rather than always talking about to what extent we can go or how much we can gain this year.

I think the close of my message is that all programs Head Start, Chapter 1, need to be funded adequately to do the jobs that are set out for them. I don't think it is a matter of whether we have the resources; I think it is a matter of our national priorities and using the resources that already exist. I think that if we are, again, serious about collaboration, that we need to look at the infrastructures of our organizations and build in them a capacity to make that real. That talking about it at a conference, at a two-day workshop and not having the time to implement that problem or go back and assess is lip service rather than real collaboration that is going to coordinate the systems that we have in place.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much. First let me say I will be back here at 1:30 to start the afternoon session. I would advise all those that desire to speak this afternoon that I will be restricting speakers to 4 minutes. That is so that we can get out on schedule because I have other places that I have to go to subsequently. And so if you are anxious to get lunch and come back, you can leave. I'll be here at 1:30 and we will start again at 1:30. I want to ask a couple of questions before. Billy, can you tell me what parental involvement meant to you? What did it mean in terms of time and the number of times ——

Mr. WHEELER. What did I do for parental involvement?

Senator JEFFORDS. Right.

Mr. WHEELER. I have every Monday morning off, which involves—I donate my time to the fluoride treatment plan in the school, which gets me in and around the kids all the time. I put in some time in the classroom. I sat in—a couple of weeks ago I sat in my oldest daughter's math class. Been known to sit in on my younger daughter's reading classes. I am always there at every parent-teacher meetings, any open house, any school activity, make sure I am there to see what my—

Senator JEFFORDS. How many teacher's meetings did you have among ——

Mr. WHEELER. Conferences between parents and teachers, we have them after every quarter.

Senator JEFFORDS. After every quarter?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, to discuss how they are going and any problems they face or have had. Like I say, we are there whenever is needed at least—I am there at least once a week—1 day a week where I put in time.

Senator JEFFORDS. How many other parents are there with you?

Mr. WHEELER. How many have I seen?

Senator JEFFORDS. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. None. Open houses there is a fair amount of turnout. I would say better than half, but still not all parents turn out to see what their kids are doing in activities. I tried promoting parental involvement, but generally the people I am talking to are the ones that are there anyways. They are there for all the other activities.

Senator JEFFORDS. Let me ask across the board, what does meaningful parental involvement mean? Susan?

Ms. JAMES. Well, I think it means that a parent is showing an interest in their child's work. It doesn't necessarily mean that they have to develop the skills to actually work with their child, but that they show a real interest in the child's work and that they are modeling certain behaviors. Like some literacy behaviors, the child needs to see the parents are involved to some degree in that. But research has pretty consistently shown that it is the interest and the valuing of education that promotes and increases the child's achievement.

Senator JEFFORDS. What resources are available to encourage parental involvement, let's say, in Brattleboro? Who do you have? Is it teachers only? Who do you have?

Ms. JAMES. Our Early Education program has a lot of parental involvement. We are co-funding a person who is doing the school transition with the families coming up, they are often families who end up being Chapter 1 families who have come out of the early ed programs. What we would like to do is find the funding to have someone to do that for regular education. I feel strongly that parent involvement for Chapter 1 should be integrated in a parent involvement for the whole school because there is a self-concept problem sometimes when you isolate out one group of people that way, but the resources are tremendously hampered by lack of time. Once they get into school, unless they are in the Follow Through program or they have some dedicated personnel, we have not been able to put the kind of time in on it we'd like to. We do conferences, and home visits and we do monthly contacts with all our Chapter 1 parents, but it is not enough. And we don't have the time to devote more than that to it.

Senator JEFFORDS. Vicki.

Ms. HORNUS. Yes, I would like to speak just a bit to that. I agree with a lot of what Susan said. I think that in the public schools we are often our own worst enemy in the sense that, as I mentioned earlier, there are a lot of options to us in how we use Chapter 1 funds, but we are very tied to how we used to use them. And every time we talk about what could we do differently, and what are the needs and how could we design the resources differently,

everyone wants to keep what we've always had and then do the other things. And it is very difficult to get people to agree to dismantle what exists, quite frankly because it is people's jobs. And so a lot of resistance comes up. So I think we have to take that responsibility in the public schools to address that and to really use the funds that we do have in a way that is more appropriate for 1993, including parental involvement and all those things. I mean, you know, as we have X many teachers whose salaries have gone up over the years, that is a big part of our Chapter 1 project, but we actually get a very nice grant.

Senator JEFFORDS. David.

Mr. SWITZ. Parent involvement is definitely a very important piece and everything they said is right on. However, one thing I would add is that——

Senator JEFFORDS. What I am trying to get is how much parental involvement do you have in your school and is it a lack of resources or the problem or do you get——

Mr. SWITZ. No, time is an issue. Providing the teachers with the time to make the connections. We have a red phone system, but just to get them that extra few minutes to get them. A small school, every minute is spent. But just one thing about parental involvement though really is that some educators will use it as an excuse for why a student isn't performing, you know, their parents don't care. And I think we need to look at it that we have to take those kids whether their parents are with us or not and move them. And we can't use it as an excuse to not educate the students.

Senator JEFFORDS. Jan.

Ms. Willey. What we do, our Chapter 1 teachers are really committed to involving parents over the long-term in meaningful ways, and one of the—our success stories is that we ask parents yearly how would you like to be involved in your child's education. Many say phone calls home on a weekly basis, many really like notes home weekly. We have several teachers who communicate daily with parents in sending materials that parents can work on with their children. They send specific tasks home, you know, with directions so the parent isn't left to figure it out on his or her own. And our rate of parent involvement is extremely high.

Senator JEFFORDS. What percentage?

Ms. Willey. I would say of the 400 Chapter 1 kids that we serve in our district, probably 75 percent I would say parents would feel very good. We ask them at the end of each year, how did it go, what could we have done better, you know, help us to help you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Is that a high percentage for the rest of you or is that average?

Mr. SWITZ. Pretty high down our way.

Ms. Willey. It drops off at the secondary level. I think our success level is much higher at K-6.

Senator JEFFORDS. Is that right?

Ms. JAMES. Though we found home visits pretty effective with middle school parents. Many of them have very bad memories of their secondary schooling, so if we can meet them somewhere else, we are much more successful. One program that has a dynamite track record with the parent is Reading Recovery. They really do a beautiful job with that.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much. Appreciate your testimony. Good time listening to it. It was very helpful. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken to reconvene at 1:40 p.m. this same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you. This afternoon we will be listening to those that signed up and asked to have an opportunity to share with me their dealings about the education system with special emphasis with Elementary and Secondary Education Act, basically Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 as we referred to, which is the basic fundamental funding source of the Federal Government for education, in particular, the primary and secondary education. We will listen to those that desire to talk.

I have a list of those that signed up. I will have to limit everyone to 4 minutes in order for us to be able to get through the hearing on time. And I would also like to say that although you are limited to 4 minutes, it doesn't mean that you have to speak 4 minutes. I don't want anybody to feel that they are compelled to take the full time if they don't want to. Anyway, why don't we start right now, and I'll name the first three, and if the first person would come forward and the other two would come down to the front, then we will keep going that way so that we can reduce the amount of time that is in between the speakers.

Anna Johnston is our first. Would you please give your name, and your home address and any other piece of relevant information that you'd like to share with us at the beginning?

STATEMENT OF ANNA JOHNSTON, SOUTH BURLINGTON, VT

Ms. JOHNSTON. Like my height maybe? Anna Johnston, I live in South Burlington. And I teach at Colchester High School, and I feel very privileged to be a part of this, and thank you for having this hearing. It feels very American to be here. And I'll be under 4 minutes.

It is easy to lapse into the comfort of cliches when the subject is money and times are tough. Cliches such as everybody has to take a cut, let's not throw our money away on wasteful programs, my taxes are too high, etc. I would pose another cliche. Kids are our most important natural resource, and money spent on them is never wasted.

As a 27-year veteran teacher, I have seen firsthand the positive impact of Federally funded programs. For over 17 years I have been a volunteer coordinator for the Fundamental program in Colchester High School. This Riff program is a true educational partnership. It is a mix of teacher and parent volunteers, local organizations and clubs, Book Riff program, Federal moneys and, of course, the students who receive the reading books provide by this program periodically over the years. I have also written a few mini grants and applied for Chapter 2 moneys. These grants have allowed me to make an idea a reality for the students. I sort of see these grants as pin money. We have enriched and varied the learning activities by attending theatre productions, touring museums, participating in classroom workshops published by authors or doing story book readings in elementary grades and donating the books.

I have seen students benefit directly from these programs with the tangibles of books or trips, but more importantly I have seen students come to realize that adults value education enough to give it their time and money. I would trust that we not heed the cliches of tough times talk and cut programs but that we, instead, continue to fund educational programs. I would trust that we continue to give our children the message that their education is a valued product. I would trust that we continue to fund programs which put money where the children are. Thank you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much, Anna.

Ms. JOHNSTON. I don't know if you want a copy of this.

Senator JEFFORDS. Yes, please. We'd like to have the copy of any written testimony that you desire.

Ms. JOHNSTON. And I don't know if you want anything like that, and some pictures.

Senator JEFFORDS. Sure. Thank you very much.

Next and in spite of what I said before, I will this time read the names of those that will be following. Bob Devaney, New England Telephone I think, and Johnathan McIntire and Dr. Brothers.

STATEMENT OF LAURIE MCLYNN, NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE, BURLINGTON, VT

Ms. MCLYNN. Good afternoon, Senator. I don't look like Bob Devaney. I am Laurie McLynn, New England Telephone, representing Bob Devaney who is not here. Mr. Devaney sends his apologies. He's relocating to Vermont and had an appointment this afternoon with his son's teacher in South Burlington. His son is learning disabled and he felt that took priority, and I agreed.

Senator JEFFORDS. He was absolutely right. We appreciate knowing that.

Ms. MCLYNN. As a globally competitive company, New England Telephone and the other NYNEX companies must have employees who are educated to a level commensurate with our international competitors. New England Tel has been an active participant in a strong partnership that is been formed between Vermont educators, business people and public policy makers all aimed at improving the education of Vermont's children. We are proud of the progress that has been made, and we look forward to the reforms and improvements that will happen in the next 70 years.

We observed that there are many different reforms and initiatives being proposed in both the State and national levels. We are a little concerned about that and feel that an effort must be made to try to integrate these reforms into a cohesive hole.

In addition to the reauthorization of Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 of the ESEA, Congress has been working on legislation under the Goals 2000 proposal, the Educate America Act. That proposal basically puts into law the National Education Goals put forth by the Bush administration. New England Telephone supports the Senate version of Goals 2000 and that we feel it best encourages the rapid development and implementation of challenging standards in the education community. It encourages education reform through implementation of standards without any linkages to other factors that might delay the standards or soften them.

While it is critical to continue to fund and support the worthwhile programs available under ESEA, reauthorization of this act should be in large measure linked to the outcome of some Goals 2000 legislation. The degree to which grants are targeting the need which is increasing should probably coincide with the establishment of some educational standards. An opportunity to learn goals as specified in the Senate version of Goals 2000.

Other Federal initiatives that have recently been proposed, should also be coordinated. Several bills such as the Classroom of the Future bill introduced by Senator Bingaman and the bill introduced by Representative Boucher will effect the quality of education of our children. We must look at the overall impact of these measures and try to get them into a coherent hole. What we should end up with is a plan that emphasizes the National Education Goals and provides states with sufficient flexibility to accomplish these goals. The Federal government should establish an educational finish line that would bring the level of education America back on a par with our international competitors. In addition, the government should encourage the development and implementation of a communications infrastructure by private industry and build upon the existing infrastructure to support these goals. Even today in Vermont New England Telephone is built upon the existing network to provide services to the education community to enhance communication and, therefore, learning.

There is no need for the Federal Government to build networks themselves or to encourage whole new duplicative networks. Private industry is willing to build the networks and provide the applications that students need; it just needs the Federal Government to provide that finish line and the environment to succeed. The Federal Government can provide the road map for education for reform via challenging standards and opportunity to learn goals, it can help those in need along the way with financial assistance via ESEA reauthorization and education grants and it can give states the appropriate flexibility and private industry the incentives to implement the reforms. After that the Federal Government can get out of the way. Thank you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you. Please leave your statement, if you don't mind, for the reporter.

Ms. MCLYNN. May I clean it up, Senator, and send it to you?

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you.

Johnathan McIntire.

STATEMENT OF JONATHAN MCINTIRE, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT, RUTLAND SOUTHWEST SUPERVISORY UNION, RUTLAND, VT

Mr. MCINTIRE. It is a pleasure to be here.

Senator JEFFORDS. And Ellie McGarry could come down and be ready. Go ahead.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I am a resident in the Town of Manchester in southern Vermont, and I work at the Rutland Southwest Supervisory Union as the Assistant Superintendent.

The reason that I wanted to speak with you today was to powerfully reinforce something in your mind, something that I think you need, which is the Federal support through Chapter 1 and Chapter

2 is critically important to our school systems here. The school system that I serve is small, under 1,000 kids. It does not have the strong tax base, and financially it is in a very difficult spot trying to provide the quality education that our kids deserve and clearly need. The Chapter 2 programs that we have implemented in our system has done some incredibly neat things, and I want you to just hear that.

We've been able to establish some gifted and talented education, a concept that really hasn't existed in our system and use that as an initiative using the Chapter 2 funds to get that program started. It has now reached a point where the communities, the parents and the school boards believe in it enough so they are willing to financially contribute. We've been able to bring in Harvest throughout the State to provide really fascinating musical, and drama and dance programs for our kids, and through music we are able to get some incredible offshoots in that one of the classes of our kids at Middletown Springs wrote a song and it clearly describes the pain they are experiencing as they live their life in a poor set of circumstances environmentally. But they were happy to be able to express it, and they weren't even realizing as they wrote it certainly the power of the words. Through the Chapter 2 funding we were able to bring that program in. And that also is something that was so well received, we believe we will be able to continue it the subsequent years with local dollars, which I think is what we are supposed to do.

The piece of Chapter 1 is a program also that I want to just touch on. I am kind of going rather fast because of the limited time. We use Chapter 1 funds to provide remedial supplemental instruction for the category of kids that aren't covered by the Special Ed law but who have very, very severe deficits in their reading and math capability. This year we've suffered a cutback in funding. The distribution process that is used, the formula, whatever it may be—I am not totally clear on it at this stage—has caused us to lose one-fifth of our funding for next year. We weren't aware of that until after our budgets were passed, so we couldn't even ask the communities to try to pick up that one-fifth. So what we've had to do is cut out the support, the supplemental instruction for math. Next year we will only provide supplemental instruction in reading. Our needs have not gone away in math, but with our limited funding and our need to try to get the maximum product, if you will, out of our investment of the minimum funds we've had, we've had to make some hard choices.

Another thing we've had to do because of funding cutbacks is essentially cut out services to junior high kids. And, frankly, we are not sure that we will be able to even pick up in any way supplementally and remedially the support those kids need. And some of those kids have arrived at our secondary level basically functionally illiterate, which is kind of hard to comprehend. So we are desperately in need for you to advocate as powerfully as you can with your colleagues in Washington funding an increase.

I know that there is been a distribution of the low-income population throughout the United States, but we still have the same population of kids who have low incomes who have incredible environmental deprivation and we also have their parents who don't

have the tax capacity to provide the funding even if we can help them understand the importance of it. And I just can't, you know, stress enough the importance of having this Federal supplement because our communities are doing the best they can with the limited funds they have. And as the State funding is cut, you know, we are put in an incredibly difficult spot, which I think would be cyclical and is very painful to watch happen. One thing I would just like to stress. In the funding form of the distribution process which, again, I don't understand fully, one of the things I have noticed this year is when we were cut our 20 percent, some welfare communities who have, "The ability to pay," were increased very significantly. And I don't mind their getting additional funds as long as we keep at least what we had, but there has to be a look at the formula for distributing the Chapter 1 funds so that our wealthy neighbors can pay to serve their low income kids. They have low-income kids and the number has gone up, but they also have multimillion dollar, you know, properties all around the little ghetto of low-income kids in our little Vermont towns. So what I am saying is the ability to pay in some of our communities is taking a large chunk of this money there, and I think there is an inequity and I would request that your staff and others look into it.

Another piece I would mention is that Vermont's a small State, as you well know, and I think it is very important for you to provide the small State minimum funding for us. I know you support that; I just wanted to reinforce your support because we have a very good Department of Education here that is working very closely with us. We are trying to be very creative in the further development of the programs we have and improve qualitatively what's happening for our kids. They need the financial support at the State department level to be able to be there to help us, and we certainly need it as well.

One final point is flexibility in the regulations. There are two particular areas. One is in how we define supplemental instruction is something I would encourage your staff to look into. A lot of the states essentially—I guess the way to say it is the funding or the program in Chapter 1, as I have watched it evolve over time, was largely built on a pull-out model, and it is easy to see that the instruction that is offered to Chapter kids in a pull-out model where children are removed from the regular classroom is, in fact, supplemental, but Vermont's one of the states that, thankfully, is doing some incredibly innovative and effective restructuring of our public school process. And we prefer not to take our kids out of the classroom. We prefer to be able to take Chapter 1 funds and human beings purchased with those funds and other resources and infuse them into the regular classroom process so we can supplement the instruction as provided to our Chapter kids and indirectly to other kids. And I think it is going to be a far better investment of our Chapter money if we can do that, but right now when we try we are kind of skirting the regulations a bit.

Senator JEFFORDS. I understand that. We are going to try to make it more flexible. Thank you.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Thank you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much.

Dr. Brothers and Susan Billings please come forward and be ready.

STATEMENT OF DR. RICHARD BROTHERS, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, RUTLAND CITY, VT

Mr. BROTHERS. Thank you, Senator, for giving us this time to address you and all of our concerns. My name is Richard Brothers from Rutland City, Superintendent of Schools. When I first heard that you were hosting this session up here, since you are one of Rutland City's finest, I knew that I would be compelled to come up here and testify for you. I would hasten to say that we are not one of those rich school districts that Johnathan just talked about that can throw money at problems. They must be elsewhere in the State.

I would like to open my remarks by simply stating the cutback, of course, in Chapter 1 funding for the State of Vermont really hurt the City of Rutland very, very, very much. 92,000 some dollars we lost, of course, has been made up from our local taxpayers, which has not helped our local taxpayers.

Leaving that subject, I just want to talk about another issue which is the Chapter program. I believe we are at a crossroads in education in this country in 1993. We've gone through many reform movements in America. I know of many of them through my study of American Education History. I know some of them through my 33 years in the business. The most recent reform movement began, in my judgment, in 1983 with the Nation at-risk report. That and all the previous reform movements called for nothing more than adding on things and increasing the amount of courses that youngsters might take. I think now 10 years later we are on the crossroads, the threshold of some significant breakthroughs in how we organize instruction for kids in our public schools. The buzz word is restructuring.

I believe that the ideas coming out of the SCANS report from the Department of Labor last spring are exactly on target with where we have to take education. For too long schools and industry have been like ships passing in the night, never talk to each other. I am beginning to see that happening now, not only here in Rutland and in the county, but I see it in the literature throughout the Nation. Because so many of us are reveling hard with restructuring efforts, it means we are also grappling seriously with the ways we go about assessing student performance.

The most significant way in my opinion that you, and the Senators and your committee can help us deal with restructure is to break down the rigidity of unreliance in the Chapter 1 program upon paper and pencil tests to control and regulate the program. Basically I am talking about flexibility also, which I understand you've heard a lot about throughout today.

Senator JEFFORDS. Yes.

Mr. BROTHERS. These regulations are nothing more than like huge anchors around our necks slowing us down in trying to provide better services for kids and merging programs like your last speaker just talked about. So I ask on behalf of the City of Rutland and hopefully on behalf of all our professional colleagues in the State for Chapter 1 to give us more flexibility, depend upon us to

use yours and our tax dollars wisely and to stop forcing us to jump through some useless hoops to find ways to skirt regulations to try to provide the things, organize programs for kids the way we want to organize—organize them most effectively.

So in a nutshell, I stand before you and ask for more flexibility in how we can administer the program, in my particular case in the City of Rutland.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much. Very well said.

Ellie McGarry and Brenda Milligan if you'd come down front please.

STATEMENT OF ELLIE MCGARRY, COORDINATOR OF CHAPTER SERVICES, RUTLAND CITY, VT

Ms. MCGARRY. Hi, I am Ellie McGarry, and I am coordinator of Chapter Services in Rutland City.

Senator JEFFORDS. Go right ahead.

Ms. MCGARRY. The first thing that I would like to speak about is flexibility again in funding, deliver services—so that we may deliver the services to our students by using a model of service delivery that promotes conclusion and not segregation, and that is, again, having Chapter teachers be able to go into classrooms, service kids and not do a pull-out model. And I would just like to add that I enjoy the visit I had with your staff the other day as they came and observed one of our schools that is providing this type of model.

Also more funding to enable us to meet the needs of students entering our school system. Our students are entering the school system more in need today than ever before. We need to increase the literacy level of our students so that when they have children they are able to read to their children. And we are finding more and more that we have parents in Rutland City, and I am sure throughout Vermont, that can't—don't even have the literacy skills to be able to pick up a primary book to be able to read it to their child. So, therefore, I think we really need more funding to be able to provide those services to kids.

And, again, with changing allocation procedures so that funds are distributed more by community and not country. As Dr. Brothers said, we were hit very hard financially in Rutland City this year and we have a very needy population of students. Because we were cut this year, there was one program that we started last year and were not able to continue expanding upon, and that was the Reading Recovery program. Our reading—the Reading Recovery program is focused on giving kids grade one level very intensive services, those students that are at risk. And because of a cut, we were not able to pick that program up and expand it, which is one thing that we would have liked to have done. So if we have more funds, then we are able to reach that population of students entering school and giving them the foundation in grades kindergarten and one that they really need in order to be successful throughout their life.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much.

Ms. MCGARRY. Thank you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Susan Billings and Beth Chamberlain come down front please.

STATEMENT OF SUSAN BILLINGS, FAMILY SERVICES COORDINATOR, FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM, BRATTLEBORO, VT

Ms. BILLINGS. My name is Susan Billings. I am here from Brattleboro. I am representing the Follow Through program which is just had its 25th anniversary. I am the Family Services Coordinator of the program in Brattleboro.

I understand it is not directly funded by the ESEA but, in any case, there are some issues with the reauthorization of this program in Washington, and just for a little background information, the Follow Through program is a primary grade program that is devoted to very interested home and school partnership. We believe strongly that parents' involvement in their children's education leads to a higher standard of performance in school. We are also very interested in the idea of transition. In Brattleboro we've developed a very strong network and working relationship with the public and private preschools that are feeding our Follow Through kindergartens and the other kindergartens that are in Brattleboro.

Another component of our program is enhanced professional and adult development for for teachers and adult development for parents. In my own experience I am a Follow Through parent from the early 80s. My child was in Follow Through in the old program that we had in Brattleboro, and I got involved in the food service job which led directly to my current employment and career in the educational programs and early intervention.

Follow Through is now associated with Brattleboro's early education services, a program whose director is Judy Jerald. It is mostly a Federally funded program. It is a very family oriented, early intervention program. Some of the different programs are Even Start, which is an ESEA program, literacy skills. We have an early education initiative preschool, which is a State funded preschool program for low-income parents. We have a locally funded parents-teachers program, which is an early intervention of infants and parents educational program, and a State funded first program which goes to our towns outside of Brattleboro.

Our local tax base in Brattleboro is limited. For example, our elementary schools this year don't seem to have any more money for field trips, which is really a sad thing. It is one of the big joys of elementary school I think is taking trips together.

I have some written testimony from Judy Jerald which addresses some of the funding problems with the ESEA, and we've brought along three parents from Brattleboro who have some statements of the personal impact that the early intervention programs have made in their lives and their family's lives. Thank you very much.

Senator JEFFORDS. Has the longitudinal study been done on the number of individuals that have gone through the program?

Ms. BILLINGS. There is a lot of data. I don't have it at my fingertips, but I am sure that Judy would be very willing to share anything she has. We've only been in existence about 6 years, and so it hasn't been that long. Our first—in fact, our first.

Senator JEFFORDS. The Follow Through program in Brattleboro has been in a lot longer than that.

Ms. BILLINGS. It was out for 10 years.

Senator JEFFORDS. It came back in?

Ms. BILLINGS. Yes, just 2 years ago. It left in 1982 and came back in in 1991.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much.

Ms. BILLINGS. Shall I give this to you?

Senator JEFFORDS. Yes, give that to me.

Ms. BILLINGS. Thank you very much.

Senator JEFFORDS. You are welcome.

Brenda Milligan. And Sue Dyer please come forward.

STATEMENT OF BRENDA MILLIGAN, BRATTLEBORO, VT

Ms. MILLIGAN. Senator Jeffords, my name is Brenda Milligan, and I am from Brattleboro. I am a mom. My son is five and a half-years old, and he was one of the first babies that was picked up by the Parents as Teachers program. That program was everything to me. It helped me with my child, it gave me moral support, self-esteem. I couldn't get out to go places because I didn't drive at the time, I was able to do this with a worker that came to my home. Through that program my son went through it. He's now involved in the Follow Through program, which has been a great—an incredible program as well for him as much as for myself as well. I am allowed to volunteer in his classroom. I know all his little friends in school. It is a pleasure to be in there. They all love it. They love the fact that parents can go into the classroom and help out. I feel like I have some sort of an insight on to my son's education. It is a beginning. The program has helped me out a lot and it is given my son a lot of self-esteem.

Senator JEFFORDS. That is good. I am pleased to hear that. I have been a follower of the Follow Through. I am embarrassed that I didn't know it started up again.

Ms. MILLIGAN. Well, it is been a very good program. I am for it 100 percent.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you. Appreciate your testimony very much.

Ms. MILLIGAN. Thank you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Sue Dyer? Did I skip somebody?

Ms. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, Beth Chamberlain.

Senator JEFFORDS. OK. That is the way to do it around here.

STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH CHAMBERLAIN, BRATTLEBORO, VT

Ms. CHAMBERLAIN. My name is Elizabeth Chamberlain, and I am a parent from Brattleboro also. I have been involved with several of the early education services for about 6 years. My family consists of three children. Timothy age seven, Corey age five and Tabitha age three. I am also very nervous. About 6 years ago I was approached by the PAT program, which is Parents as Teachers. My oldest child was about 1 year old at the time. This was a very valuable program for me. I was a working mother, and worked in an apple orchard at this time. It showed me how to cope with small children, work and still find enough time for my family. It also gave me some wonderful ideas on how to find new things to do with my child.

My association with this group ended only when we moved temporarily to New Hampshire. I wish that we had thought better of

this because by that time my oldest son was three and had I a new baby that was about 9 months old. Because of our move, my son Timothy never went to nursery school. We moved back to town about 1 year later and now I had three children. I had just had the daughter my husband and I sought. It was time to register Timothy for kindergarten. I did so and was approached by the family support program who had found out that I had an infant at home. I cannot begin to tell you how much I have come to depend on this organization.

I have gone through many traumas in the last few years. My family has changed in so many ways. When my husband was having a problem with alcohol and I didn't know how to handle it, these caring people showed me the way to get hem for him as well as for myself. They have helped with getting my children better organized, such as discipline and teaching them how to be part a family and what that means.

Recently about 1 year ago I decided to forgo my education and go to school. For approximately 5 years I had worked as a CNA and had decided to become a nurse. The Family Support program came to my aid and showed me how to go through the appropriate channels for funding as well as help financially and other ways such as books, calculators, etc., but mostly they gave me a lot of moral support. I am happy to report that I have been accepted to a school of nursing and will be going there in the fall. There are other wonderful programs too.

Esteville Preschool has had my son Corey for 2 years. I can see the difference in my two boys' readiness for kindergarten. And I believe this program is wholly responsible for the change. My son, Corey, is much more ready than Timothy ever was. I also feel the transition will be easier for both Corey and the rest of the family because of this. My husband and I also took a positive discipline course that was sponsored through the Follow Through program last year, and it is made our family run much smoother. The children now feel a sense of belonging that was not there before, and our household has become a nicer place to live. We find that all the services we have received to be immensely helpful, and I can only hope that they will be allowed to continue so that other families may benefit from them too.

Where are we now? We are a much more happy and solvent family. My husband has a better job. I am in school, and in a couple of years I will be a nurse. My children are thriving. These are things that these programs have done for my family, and these are things that I hope these continued programs can do for other families.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you so much. Those programs that you are a model of I hope we can do for many more people. Thank you. Sue Dyer and Norman Gluckman please come forward.

STATEMENT OF SUE DYER, EARLY EDUCATION SERVICES, BRATTLEBORO, VT

Ms. DYER. I am Sue Dyer. I also work for Early Education Services in Brattleboro under the first grant, which is the fund for improvement and reform of schools in training. I work in the outlying towns and wanted to share very briefly what we've done with our

grant money. We've developed a home visiting program for the 20 some families in the outlying towns, Vernon, Gilford, Putney and Dummerston. Home visitors visit these families once a week dealing with parenting skills and early childhood development opportunities serving families with children newborn through age 3.

The second thing we've done is to develop play groups in each of these communities to enable isolated moms, and there are some dads as well, who come into the—a setting in the school once a week with their preschooler meeting other children with whom they'll eventually go to kindergarten. It is been very exciting this first year, and in all of these cases these families are continuing on their own throughout the summer to meet.

The third piece of the program for this year has focused on developing a summer program—two-week program for kids who will be going to kindergarten in the fall. They'll be meeting with their kindergarten teacher in the kindergarten classroom so that they'll get to know one another, get the idea of what kindergarten's all about, and this has a very strong parent involvement piece as well. I hope that you'll be—continue to be supportive of the early intervention needs of children in Vermont. We feel that what's happened in this program speaks to those needs.

And in closing I might add that in 1971 I also was a Follow Through parent and went on to serve 10 years on the school board and had a currier, and personnel and now I am back doing what I really love best, and I hope you'll continue to support us.

Senator JEFFORDS. Well, I certainly will, and I certainly support you and all that you've done. Thank you for your efforts.

Ms. DYER. Thanks very much.

Senator JEFFORDS. Sharon Winter. And will Freddie Graves come forward please.

STATEMENT OF SHARON WINTER, VERNON, VT

Ms. WINTER. I am a mom, and I am from Vernon, VT. And my daughter is in the Home Base program for preschoolers. And I would just like to say thank you for supporting the programs and please continue to do so. My daughter, who is now in kindergarten, will be in the Chapter 1 next year. She has some learning difficulties, and she's going through a lot of tests right now, so she really needs that support system. The group—the social group that I am in for my daughter and I have really helped me a lot as a mom to relate to my children. I am learning to drive through her teacher, which I never thought I would do. I mean, that was just something I never thought would happen. Hopefully within a month I'll be going back to work. And I am like the other lady; I would like to get my nurse's license, continue on with my education to better my daughter's life and for myself. But it is really helped me with my self-esteem being around the other parents, getting my kids into a social group so that I could relate to them because you know what it is like if you are home 24 hours a day with your children; you are pulling your hair out. And it is just helped me so much personally and for my kids too. We really need the Chapter 1 funding for, you know, the kids. Thank you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much. Very helpful to hear good stories.

Paul Browne come forward and, Norman, please proceed.

STATEMENT OF NORMAN GLUCKMAN, LIBRARIAN AT COLCHESTER HIGH SCHOOL, COLCHESTER, VT

Mr. GLUCKMAN. Good afternoon. My name is Norman Gluckman, and I am the Librarian at Colchester High School. And I am representing the Vermont Educational Reading Association, a State organization for schools. School Library and Media programs are an integral part of the educational infrastructure which supports not only curriculum but also the unique information needs of the age group that is served.

The American Library Association suggests that the role of Library Media programs is to ensure that students and staff are effective users of ideas and information. This empowerment requires access to up-to-date resources and technology. In Vermont the ability of library media specialists to maintain or even achieve this role has been hampered by inadequate funding from local, State, and Federal sources over a period of years. As a result, collections are outdated, library media resources supporting learning challenged students or various at-risk populations are inadequate, and the acquisition of information technology has been accomplished at the cost of other aspects of the Library Media program.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 Title II allocated funds for upgrading library collections. In the 70s Title II was absorbed into Chapter block grants. Library Media programs found themselves competing with other uses for available funds. As a result, the Library Media program's share of Chapter funds has declined. In Vermont in 1989 12 percent of Chapter funds went to library and media grants. By 1992 only 5 percent was allocated to Vermont Library Media programs. Concurrent with this loss of Federal funding has been the decline of school library and media budgets at a time when new demands were being placed on programs.

The need to purchase new technology including new audio visual formats such as switching from BETA to VHS video technology forced many librarians into a dilemma of deciding between books and technology. State mandates such as Act 230, the mainstreaming of learning challenged students in the classroom and laws requiring the confidentiality of circulation records have further tacked limited resources. The cumulative effect of the shifts to block grants, declining budgets and new mandates is deteriorating collections of outdated material with—which are inadequate for student informational needs.

The Vermont Educational Media Association strongly encourages your support and sponsorship of the Elementary and Secondary School Library Media Act as 266 and HR1151, which would create a division of elementary and secondary school library media services and the Department of Education and would establish a series of grants for library materials, curriculum development and the application of computer information technology.

Information literacy in all its forms is a critical skill. The quality of our lives, the success of our endeavors, the well-being of our Nation is dependent upon our ability to be critical consumers of infor-

mation. School Library Media programs are essential to the development of productive citizens. Thank you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much. Appreciate being made aware of what's happened to the program. Thank you.

Freddie Graves, next. Go right ahead. Good to see you here. And Louis Welna please come forward. Go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF FREDDIE GRAVES, FAYSTON, VT

Ms. GRAVES. Thank you. I don't know much about the Federal government, but I am honored to have been invited here and I'll gladly share my opinions and concerns with you.

We have Chapter 1 and Special Ed teachers for the kids who function below the 40th percentile. All my numbers are from teachers in school. I hope they are correct. What do we have for kids on the other end of the spectrum? Right now really nothing. If these kids are not challenged, we will lose them as surely as we would lose the Chapter 1 students without the current programs.

Teachers and administrators need to be accountable. At this time parents, kids and taxpayers have no recourse when a teacher or administrator is not doing their job. A teacher needs to teach specific skills as well as to excite the kids and make them thirst for knowledge. A good administrator needs to manage the school, listen to and address parents' concerns and he or she needs to make the kids' education a team effort and to have the initiative and vision to lead the school to excellence.

When the country gave rise to unions, it was a vital necessity. Now the tail seems to be wagging the dog. This needs to change. It needs to be fair to the kids and the taxpayers as well as to the teachers. There needs to be a high nationwide minimum that each child must meet to go on to the next grade as well as guidelines and testing that force teachers to put out and be their best so that each child reaches their maximum potential. I believe that this is what any good teacher worth their weight must do, but we must give them the tools

We need to limit class sizes, primarily in the beginning grades. Kindergarten, first and second grade, I think there should—particularly in kindergarten there should be no more than ten children to a teacher, otherwise, they become a baby-sitter and these kids aren't moving forward. Even though we are a public school, we cannot be all things to all people. I believe in early ed and Head Start, but when a child comes to school after these programs and is unprepared; an example, unfed, unrested, disrespectful and unaware of their privilege to learn and is disruptive, it affects all the other kids' chance to learn.

With the resources available, the school must remedy what they can, but at some point a business decision must be made and the rights and needs of the one or few cannot be allowed to overshadow the rights and the needs of the many. The school must have the authority to remove the child from the classroom or school and force the responsibility back to the parents. Not everyone can be mainstreamed. We cannot hold back the kids who are ready to surge ahead and some day lead our country. We cannot provide womb to tomb care. People need to do things for themselves.

This all seems to come down to values, both monetary and moral. For the parents who are preparing their kids for school, the kids must in turn provide—let me try that again. I don't know what I just read. For the parents who are preparing their kids for school, the school must, in turn, provide the kids with the best education and allow each kid to reach their maximum potential. The best technical education will not take the child or our country forward without strong moral values and the successful parent school team will prepare the child for the path and not the path for the child.

So I guess, Senator Jeffords, what I am really asking is for the Federal government to step back, stop overmandating and regulating and to either set up some regionalized pilot programs with local controls—we need to do what's relative for each area—or offer incentives to schools that are flexible enough to challenge all of the kids who want to learn and allow the schools the ability to remove the disruptive kids and ineffective teachers and maybe this will save the American education system from mediocrity.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you.

Ms. GRAVES. And, by the way, I am from Fayston, one of the rich towns. We don't feel that rich.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you. I understand your feelings.

Paul Browne. And Art Farnum. Please come forward, Art.

STATEMENT OF PAUL BROWNE, SPRINGFIELD, VT

Mr. BROWNE. I thank you for inviting me here.

Senator JEFFORDS. Please go right ahead.

Mr. BROWNE. My boy is a Chapter 1 student, and Springfield has one of the best Special Education departments I have ever seen. I have been involved with Fair Haven, Castleton, and the Vermont Achievement Center, Winston Prouty and then we went onto Union Street School and then to Park Street. They have brought this boy—did he give you a folder a while ago? And there are a number of news articles in there.

Senator JEFFORDS. I have it right here.

Mr. BROWNE. And there are a number of news articles as to how Springfield took a boy that couldn't talk and then he come here a couple months or so ago and he read a letter that he composed before our local State Senators and representatives. And it is such a great success that I felt you needed a copy of the news stories that were done. You have one that was done in 1989 and then the newest one which was done by a local paper in Springfield.

And what I see as an advocate for my boy as well as a teenager whom is in Springfield High School—he is not my own son, but he asked me if I would advocate for him for Special Education, and I accepted that, with my son. I see where the high school needs some improving. One of the things, I believe they need to have more of the vocational training for these special needs children. They do not have them at this present time at Springfield High School or at the Riverside Middle School, which I feel they need this in both places because if we expect these children when they grow up to be a productive member of this society, they've got to be trained hands on. They can't be trained with a book. They've got to be trained hands on.

And the other, of course, that I have had a chance to see firsthand, I am a little slower than most, and I tried taking a couple college courses in Springfield. And two of them I had to drop out of, simple computer courses, but it was because the rest of them were fast. They don't have the time to take it slow for someone who is slow. I stand here today and I hear people saying deregulate. Well, if you deregulate—I just barely got the laws and the regulations so as to protect the boys and girls of Chapter 1, so as I can make sure right now with them deregulations that this 18 year old boy isn't going to be denied his education. I can make sure that this boy right here isn't going to be denied his education because he's Chapter 1 and he's slow.

And I think that we have to be careful how we deregulate because with too much deregulation—what I am hearing is take these kids and put them in a classroom all by themself. I don't like hearing that because there is an article in there on this boy with me on his teacher where she just got an award and one thing and another. And she went from Special Ed teacher to a regular classroom teacher, and she tells it all in that news story there that you have where she feels that not only do the Special Ed children learn from being in the regular classroom, but high performance student learns how to deal with the one that is slower. And they help one another, they integrate. And I believe her wholeheartedly. And this lady has put her heart and sole in it.

And this is what I ask you is to be careful how you deregulate and, if possible, if there is some more Federal funds, what I would like to see is to capitalize on what Springfield has and make it better. There is always room for improvement in any situation, and this is what basically we need is to capitalize on what we have.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much for your testimony, and I assure you I am going to read the articles.

Mr. BROWNE. I thank you for your time and thank you for having me here.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you for your testimony.

Louis Welna.

STATEMENT OF LOUIS WELNA, CHURCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Mr. WELNA. I feel insignificant compared to this gentleman's testimony.

Senator JEFFORDS. State your name for the record.

Mr. WELNA. My name is Louis Welna. I am at Church Elementary School. Considering what I have just heard, it seems to me that what I am about to say almost amounts to some whining, and I apologize. In 1987 ——

Senator JEFFORDS. Excuse me a second. Would Penny Kolunger please come down. Penny here?

Ms. KOLUNGER. Yes, I am here.

Senator JEFFORDS. You are right there. Go ahead.

Mr. WELNA. In 1987 our reading program received the Certificate of Merit for excellence in compensatory education. And during the past 6 years we've been watching students on the seventh and eighth grade honor rolls, and we found that 25 to 33 percent of all those students who were in Chapter 1 reading and/or math were

successful. And this past month we took a look at the graduating class of 1993 and of those 21 seniors who were in Chapter 1 reading and/or math in the elementary school, 16 will attend various colleges and universities. The point here is, is that some Chapter 1 programs work, but not all successful programs can be measured merely in NCE scores. For some of those graduating seniors Chapter 1 held their hands for five to 6 years.

I would like to make three quick points. I think it is time to permit alternate kinds of assessment to measure the effectiveness of Chapter 1 instruction. We need assessments that reflect the more complex definitions of reading. I know that I am not alone in this belief, but I no longer want to be held hostage to the results of fill in the bubble kind of tests where supposedly there is only one answer and the job of the student is to find the answer that the test company thinks is correct. For the student, however, finding the correct answer is not dependent on any higher ordered thinking skills, no matter what the test companies may say but, rather, it is based on the avoidance of the test company's attempt at trickery and deceit. I can show you many examples in published tests where the best answer is not the correct one. So you will need in your new legislation to encourage the development of performance based reading and math assessments including the use of local norms.

No. 2, there has been some talk that the new legislation will require more in class rather than pull-out models, that there will be new requirements for more parental involvement, more coordination with classroom teachers, more meetings, more paperwork. All these attempts to make Chapter 1 more complicated should be rejected. Chapter 1 is simple, keep it simple. In fact, we ought to be concerned with the issue of finding better and more effective ways of instructing children. Given a text, a student and a teacher, the issue is and has always been, what do I need to know to tell the student, what the student needs to hear at the time the student needs to hear it so that he or she can begin to take charge of their quest to become literate. Everything else is secondary to those instructional attempts, and yet what I see is the trend in Chapter 1 is to take secondary considerations and try to make them primary. Please don't promote anything which takes away the student's instructional time or the teacher's planning time.

And finally I have heard criticisms of Chapter 1's ineffectiveness, and I suggest the following as a partial solution. If you teach Chapter 1 reading, it seems to me that you should have certification in reading. If you teach Chapter 1 math, you ought to be certified in math. Thank you, Senator.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much. Excellent testimony.

Art Farnum, and will Frank Murphy please come forward. Go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF ART FARNUM, LAMOILLE NORTH SUPERVISORY UNION, MONTPELIER, VT

Mr. FARNUM. Thank you very much. My name is Art Farnum. I work in the Lamoille North Supervisory Union, and I very much appreciate your courtesy in meeting with me in the town where I live and I also appreciate you going the extra mile and meeting me on the street where I live. Very kind of you.

I would like to talk to you today about Chapter 2 educational block grants, and I thought that I would like to approach my comments a little bit differently. I would like to tell you what you are doing right. I want to make sure that there are some babies that are not thrown out with the bath water as you go through the reauthorization process. I have a short list, and not that it is a short list of things that you are doing right, but a short list in terms of time that you have available. Leave it to me, I can always foul things up, can't I? I want to share with you this brief list.

First of all, the regulations are broad enough and flexible enough to allow local school districts to do what they need to do. It allows us the flexibility to have local control. It allows us to have the flexibility to put in place summer programs or programs for children who are gifted and talented, children who have disabilities, all kinds of children, and we appreciate that flexibility.

Second, one of the things that we appreciate is the fact that with Chapter deregulations, the paperwork is very, very manageable. In light of the fact that I am a Special Education administrator, I am particularly sensitive to the manageability of paperwork.

Third, we appreciate the fact that Chapter 2 regulations are seed money to try out new initiatives, and I am very proud of the fact that Vermont is very true to the seed money concept in these regulations.

You have already heard that Vermonters very much appreciate your support and are asking for your continued support of the small State minimum allocation. Yet another important concept in the Chapter 2 regulations are the State Advisory Council. State Advisory Council members—and I am on the Chapter 2 State Advisory Council—council members work very closely with Lynn Provasi, the coordinator of the Chapter 2 program in the State Department of Education. We work so closely with the Department of Education that we even participate on site evaluations.

That neatly brings me to my next point, that site evaluations of Chapter 2 programs are very, very different from the monitoring that takes place in Special Education. In Chapter 2 site visits when we are in local school districts looking at their Chapter 2 programs, yes, we take a look and make sure that the regulations are being met, but we are really focusing on what are the neat things that you are doing, how can we assist you in doing them better, and how can we bring the wonderfully creative ideas that you have to other school districts throughout Vermont. And that is a very exciting and very fun aspect of being on the State Advisory Council.

We appreciate the fact that there is parent and community involvement requirement within the Chapter 2 regulations.

And the final comment that I would like to make is that Vermonters are incredibly creative, and we have been doing so much with so little in terms of dollars and cents that I just can't imagine the creative things that we could produce if Chapter 2 funding were holding steady or better yet, rising instead of decreasing. And thank you for your time.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much. Excellent testimony, and I agree with you.

Penny. And would Debby Minkler please come forward?

STATEMENT OF PENNY KOLUNGER, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELOR, SOUTH BURLINGTON, VT

Ms. KOLUNGER. My name is Penny Kolunger, and I am an Elementary School Counselor in South Burlington. I wanted to speak a little bit about our need to really accept and seriously deal with the impact of two working parents on educating children, and people have mentioned a number of components. I think we really don't have enough child care for preschoolers, especially quality child care. Children today spend almost as much time in child care before they enter school as they later spend in public school. And the quality of this care is very important for a young family, and it has a big, positive payoff for children's educational performance later.

Likewise, parents find it very hard to find adequate after school care. I am constantly being approached by parents for suggestions for after school care, and many times there just aren't many things I can suggest. Many times by the middle school age of ten children are generally home alone. I think this is just crazy for our society. I think it is disasters waiting to happen, and many times quietly happening that we don't hear about until the kids are in high school. I hear reports of children who are getting involved with drugs and sex at this age, even in little old Vermont, and it is a reflection on a bigger scale of what we hear happening in large cities.

My point is that I think we now need access to after school programs for all children until about 6 p.m., not that everyone will necessarily take advantage of it, but it needs to be available. And we need to help with providing programs like that. How to get things coordinated and organized. I don't think it is so much funding of it as funding assistance, and coordination and maybe incentives to get things started. I think it is because what happens in these hours does affect our children's readiness to learn during the rest of their time. Likewise, in the summers many young children five, six, 7 years of age are baby-sat all day by older siblings sometimes no older than 10 years old. Why have summers off when it doesn't meet the needs of kids nor working parents? Can't we offer some kind of stimulating programs that are fun and expand learning?

It is a problem we could easily solve with personnel. We do have the facilities, the schools, but I don't think it is going to happen if we base it solely on local funding because, once again, the school districts are getting defeated just in terms of their existing programs.

Another thing that has been mentioned, I think, is parent education. My feeling is all parents need education in the area of parenting, and I think there is still some sense that parent education is for parents who are having problems with parenting, as if all parents do not have problems with parenting. Why don't we expect that all parents get some training given the primary responsibility of rearing the next generation and being the primary advocates for children. They all need to help with communication skills, conflict resolution, managing behavior and encouragement of children. They also all need a lot more support than they are currently

receiving. And in local needs assessments in my communities this is what I am hearing from parents.

Another area I think people need some support and leadership at the Federal level is in terms of television. Other than pulling the plug, which some parents do, parents and schools struggle to teach children positive social skills and values. But with children averaging four hours of television a day, that is a major negative influence and it is terribly irresponsible. It is chosen to be and sometimes is downright harmful. Research tells us that unequivocally humans are very susceptible to suggestion, and children I think also. And I think it is no wonder we are dealing with a level of violence considering what we see on TV. Surely there is some way we can provide incentives or some limits of control in the industry. These are my comments. Thank you very much for listening.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you. Very helpful.

Frank. Please again state your name.

STATEMENT OF FRANK MURPHY, DIRECTOR OF SPECIAL SERVICES, ESSEX JUNCTION AND WESTFORD

Mr. MURPHY. Frank Murphy, and I am the director of special services in Essex Junction and Westford. And thank you, Senator, for this opportunity. And like everyone else, I am deeply appreciative of it.

I have a few comments that I would like to say, and I would like to speak to them primarily as the representative of the Westford School District. As a result of the change in the Census that you've heard so much about today, we lost $11,000. That is a significant amount of money for Westford to lose, particularly given the budgetary battles that we are fighting at this particular time. And it imposes a severe hardship. We will certainly endure, but our efforts will be diluted and our quality decreased and opportunities for the disadvantaged students will definitely be reduced.

If there is a common theme here today, in my interpretation it is that we we as a society are in an acute crisis, one for which the remedy exceeds greater efficiency and cooperation but rather calls for a solid and sustained commitment from our political leaders. History will most certainly judge our success or failure as a society on this issue more than any other. There is little that has been said today that I would disagree with. There are two issues I would like to address.

First is the issue of flexibility and how it relates directly to avoiding establishing what the research calls a lifelong cycle of defeatism. Our policies, procedures and practices need to demand instructional opportunities that maximize serving the disadvantaged as an integral part of the classroom; not as an aberration to be removed and fixed. The small incremental growth in norm reference tests in no way reflects the gradual, powerful and malignant development of an attitude that says, I am different and I cannot succeed. The concept inherent in Chapter 1 is to assist a disadvantaged as a function of improving their opportunities to participate in our society at large. This can only occur if children receive positive encouragement within the context of their natural social environment, their classroom. As such, Chapter 1 should strive to identify and require practices which promote flexibility and then place

greater emphasis on supporting teachers and less on removing students. We have too long embraced the practice of creating a dual system of education.

Finally, like everyone else, I again would like to thank you for your support and leadership. I want to tell you that as an educator and as a citizen that I am deeply troubled by what I see happening in our schools. Today we face enumerable challenges which previously were considered outside of our realm. Families, parents, children and educators are under a tremendous pressure, and it is infuriating to watch, and this is not a dig, Senator, our political leaders engage in the moral equivalent of fiddling. And would you please bring that message back to Washington? Thank you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you. I assure you I will.

Debby Minkler, and will Tom Sonneborn, and Frances Hersey and Kim Tomlinson please come forward. Please go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF DEBBY MINKLER, CHAPTER 1 TEACHER, EDMONDS MIDDLE SCHOOL, BURLINGTON, VT

Ms. MINKLER. Thank you. I am Debby Minkler. I am a Chapter 1 teacher in Burlington at Edmonds Middle School. I taught for over 22 years. I have been Chapter 1 for 14, I have been involved in Head Start and VISTA, so I have worked with youngsters for a long time. I didn't come here to speak; I came here to listen, but I got motivated this morning.

I think it was Noreen O'Connor and Winton—I have forgotten his name. They were speaking about the integration of business and schools, and that is been a particular interest to me. I work at the middle school where, yes, the kids come in with low skills, difficulties, but by this time we are also dealing with severe issues of motivation and self-esteem as well as adolescent issues, and it is a different kind of a problem I think than elementary and preschool. So our school has been involved in restructuring. We have an in-class model. We do a lot of work with homework. We have parents' support group that we are trying to get more involved, but we still find that there are other needs.

And a couple years ago we started a work study program and we got money from the Vermont Children's Trust Fund and the United Way for 1 year. We worked with Burlington Youth Employment to set up a work study program for kids under 14 and used the work as a motivator and being in school. You couldn't go to work if you didn't come to school. It was very successful but, unfortunately, we did not get funding again. It went to other worthwhile programs, and we struggled to get our funding which didn't happen. But it really showed us how effective it was for these kids. They had positive role models for the community and business people to be involved, grades were improved, kids were less truant, it was very successful.

A year or two ago we also, through the Chapter 1 money, got an innovative grant to start an after school program to provide enrichment and sort of job shadowing in the community for kids, and this is the end of it because it was an innovative way I think—money's no longer available. So we are trying to think of how we can refund it without cutting other things that we currently have.

So the reason I am speaking today is that I would really support Chapter 1 in looking at ways to support these kinds of integration of community, job experiences and enrichment along with the educational academic component because, I think, particularly for middle school, if you want to keep the middle school, if we want them to get to high school, we need to keep them engaged and we need to somehow get the motivation there and raise the self-esteem. So I support any kind of funding that would support that.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you. Very fine message.

Tom Sonneborn.

STATEMENT OF TOM SONNEBORN, REGIONAL CONSULTANT FOR THE DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING, RUTLAND, VT, AND PRESIDENT OF THE VERMONT DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES COUNCIL

Mr. SONNEBORN. Senator Jeffords, my name is Tom Sonneborn. I live in Rutland. I work in the field of education as a Regional Consultant for the Deaf and the Hard of Hearing. And I serve as President of the Vermont Developmental Disabilities Council. I am here today representing the Council, which is a system change and advocacy organization composed of 32 volunteers appointed by the governor. Our membership includes primary and secondary consumers as well as State and private service providers. Our goal is to ensure that all people with developmental disabilities have access to services, programs and support that will help them be productive, integrated members of their communities.

Chapter 1 was created to assist children having problems with reading or math. Approximately 10,000 Vermont students are receiving some assistance, yet educators have told us that we are only reaching half of the eligible population. And many of the students who need assistance in both math and reading are only receiving assistance in one area. What happens to those students who are unserved or underserved? We fear that failure to provide appropriate intervention leads to a situation of neglect for students until they fall so far behind that it appears that they become discouraged and turned off to classroom activity. Some fall so far behind that they become eligible for Special Education services, a more intensive and more costly service delivery model.

In Vermont about 80 percent of Chapter 1 funds goes to students to support children in elementary school with the remainder split between preschoolers and secondary students. Obviously there are many secondary students who could benefit from Chapter 1 services. For these students high school is probably going to be their last formal education. If these young people are to be productive community members, we must ensure that they have the skills needed to compete in an increasingly technical job market. If their math and reading skills are deficient, we have severely limited their options and choices and have placed them at risk of needing more costly social support systems such as welfare.

During their adult years, providing Chapter 1 supplemental services to students in high school can be a cost-effective method to upgrading the skill level of our work force while preventing reliance on more expensive services. More funds need to be targeted to sec-

ondary students, but that isn't feasible until there is a significant increase in overall program funding.

In preparing the comments we talked with both State and local level educators. They were unanimous in their support for this program. As one local principal told us, there is no Federal or State program that has a more immediate, direct impact on making a turnaround for students experiencing difficulty in the classroom. One of the positive aspects noted by local educators is the flexibility to provide services in different settings, i.e., small groups within the regular classroom for a one-to-one basis. Students learn from each other, so whenever possible we believe Chapter 1 services should be provided in an integrated setting. This integration or conclusion is consistent with the goals of Vermont Act 230 which stresses the provision of educational support services in the regular classroom.

We think Chapter 1 services could go further if flexibility and creativity are encouraged in the reauthorization. We believe educators will develop summer programs and other supplemental programs to accomplish program goals. Regulation must ensure flexibility so that the specific needs of children can be addressed in a locally determined manner.

As you are well aware, Vermont is a very rural and very poor State. In 1990 one in every eight Vermont children lived in poverty. Chapter 1 services were originally created to assist this at-risk population to be successful in school. Everything we know about Chapter 1 indicates that this is a successful program and yet this program is being cut $600,000 in Vermont. Considering the effectiveness of the program and the unmet need expansion, not program cuts, seem to be the only logical course.

We know you have been a long-time supporter of educational programs to assist all students. We thank you for your efforts and encourage you to spearhead the fight to expand Chapter 1 so that the children who need supplemental services both at the elementary and secondary level have both the language, arts and math programs they need.

Senator Jeffords, we thank you for holding the hearing in Vermont and for giving us the opportunity to comment.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much, Tom.

Frances Hersey.

STATEMENT OF FRANCES HERSEY, EAST HAVEN, VT

Ms. HERSEY. I am Frances Hersey. I live in East Haven, and I work in Danville School which is about 438 kids all the way from the 3 and 4 year old early ed people all the way up through to twelfth grade. In our school, as many people have said already, we are touched every day by all of these programs, as a librarian I see Chapter 1 work go on all day long. Chapter 2, I am on the committee for. I am on the committee for the Eisenhower grants and also for the Drug-Free School grants, and I am sure that there is not a day that goes by that we don't see a child helped. And many people have said this eloquently, so I think I'll give you one tiny, concrete example of how this works.

This year, thanks to Chapter 2, I am going to be able to put my library on computer, so I hope that this year's seniors are the last

ones that go to college and look at the library and go, help. In doing that what I have to do is go through each book in the library, I pick it up, if it looks like a real veteran, it is been around a long time, oh, it is probably out of date, turn to the back, see how many kids have used it. And every once in a while I get one of these and kid after kid generations are stamped all over it. There is names all over it. Turn to the front it says, ESEA, 1965. It is been used, and the reason we have not thrown it out is it is something about mammals, or Vermont or it is something that we still need.

And when you think about it, almost 30 years little tiny Vermont fingers have been turning those pages and have been learning from that book. And it is wonderful. I don't know what a book costs back then. I know it was a lot less than it does now, but that one small piece of Chapter 2 block grant has done this for almost 30 years. So I am just here to say thank you, and we need more books. Thank you very much.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much.

Next witness is Kim Tomlinson, and then we will hear from John Perry.

STATEMENT OF KIM TOMLINSON

Mr. TOMLINSON. Thank you, Senator Jeffords, for inviting me to be here today and, I am very appreciative of you holding these in the State. I want to approach my comments from a little bit different aspect. I am a native of Vermont and went through the high schools here in Vermont and took my degree at the University of Vermont and went there and served in the International Guard in Vermont. In each of those cases I had opportunity to be either a tutor or an instructor. During my military service I had the opportunity to travel around the U.S. but chose to return to Vermont and am currently employed with the IBM Corporation in Essex where I have been teaching there also on my own and lecturing on business for about 8 years.

The opinions that I render, of course, are my own, not those of IBM Corporation, but they do flavor what I have to say in that we view that there are two models of learning. One is a Greek model of learning. It says that the education is important for the enlightenment that I gained. The other is a Hebrew model of learning that says the only value to education is if I have the ability to apply it. And it is in that area that I want to address two concerns which may come under consideration with the reauthorization of this bill.

The first is the area of competitiveness of our educational systems. In business competitiveness is measured by quality and cost. In these two areas current education system seems to be struggling. Burlington Free Press reported a short while ago of a national trend in declining SAT scores. And some people have pointed out that perhaps that in itself is not the correct measurement, but I do think in having interacted with people after they graduated trying to apply the education they have learned that there has been a more difficult time in that. At the same time costs are rising while producing what appears to be a declining product.

Again, article from the Burlington Free Press which quotes as a source New England Board of Higher Education shows that the average cost per pupil for the period of 1988 to 1993 in Vermont has

risen from $5,000 per student to $7600 per student. Vermont is currently the sixth highest per pupil in the Nation. Hurray for that. At least we are getting some support, but at the same time that spending is up 50 percent from 5 years ago. If that was a mutual fund, there is not anybody that would love to invest in that kind of growth in funds and at the same time we have a declining SAT score. At the same time a review of selected private schools indicates that they can achieve similar results for approximately 3,000 to $5,000 per pupil less. Although a direct comparison certainly cannot be made, I think it does highlight that perhaps there is some learning that we could do in the public sector and to see if there is a better cost to quality ratio that could be achieved.

The second issue that I wanted to speak to was the issue of choice. It is for a long period of time those families which are in a wealthier income bracket that have had the ability to select those schools to place their children in which meet their family educational goals. Choice is not available in the same proportion to those in low and middle-income families. Some form of grant which would equalize the purchasing power might go a long ways to helping these families also have the ability to choose. With that in mind, it is important to know that that issue is very complicated and doesn't have simple answers, but I would like to have you consider at least these things.

Education really is the responsibility of the parents; it is not the responsibility of the government or of institutions. Inculcation of values is an inescapable event in the education of those children. Parents, therefore, must be able to select the school and the values represented by that school for the education of their children without a financial penalty. Because of the lack of choice, there appears to be an absence of competition which exists among schools and many children are forced to attend schools which have not provided adequate education. Any program, therefore, to support choice must be directed toward helping the families and not necessarily a grant specifically to the institution. This will help increase family participation and also family accountability in their responsibility in bringing their own children up. The support of choice should specifically avoid government control of private schools and provide proper protection from undue government regulation, which I think we've already heard today.

So in short I just would like to encourage the committee to look specifically at the two issues of competitiveness and choice and that in any reauthorization of this bill to try to structure those incentives so that they would operate at the local level with local accountability and local control. Thank you very much.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you.

John Perry and Sue Mahoney on deck here.

STATEMENT OF JOHN PERRY, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, VERMONT DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, MONTPELIER, VT

Mr. PERRY. Senator, I am John Perry from the Vermont Department of Corrections. I am Director of Planning. I am representing John Gorczyk and Bob Lucenti who couldn't be here.

Senator, as you know, the lack of effective education is correlated strongly with the number of negative social indicators, not the least

of which is crime and subsequent incarceration. 80 percent of the offenders who are admitted to Vermont's correctional facilities have not graduated from high school. They are high school dropouts. We are attempting to build a comprehensive program of services to support the instruction of young offenders in our adult correctional facilities.

As is consistent with Act 230 and the best practices recommended by the Vermont Department of Education, we envision a service delivery model which encourages and supports an integrated, noncategorical approach. We would like to use Chapter 1 funds to support these efforts, as such we would like to do it as a funding source rather than as a separate and distinct program, yet we want to ensure that our model remains in compliance with Chapter 1 regulations with respect to the supplement but not supplant role. This requires that these regulations allow considerable flexibility in that it may not be readily apparent where the regular program ends and the Chapter 1 program begins. This is particularly true in our correctional facilities which comparatively to the rest of the country are small with relatively small populations of 100 in a facility like St. Johnsbury's.

Of particular importance is the collection of attendance data, and that the attendance in the programs supported by Federal funds is not counted. There are two issues, like many people here today, that we are concerned with. We are concerned with the level of funding. The level of funding on a per capita basis for correctional offenders has decreased approximately 20 percent per capita over the last 25 years, and I have a graph here.

Senator JEFFORDS. I appreciate seeing that. Thank you.

Mr. PERRY. In addition, we are concerned with, as I mentioned, the increasing use of a noncategorical approach to this program to allow us the flexibility to deliver the kinds of services that we all know will help offenders reintegrate more successfully into society. Thank you very much for this opportunity, Senator.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you. Very helpful testimony. Thank you very much, John.

Sue Mahoney.

STATEMENT OF SUE MAHONEY, COORDINATOR OF THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES PROGRAM AT THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, MONTPELIER, VT

Ms. MAHONEY. Hi, I am Sue Mahoney. I am here as the Coordinator of the Drug-Free Schools and Communities program at the Department of Education. I was not planning on speaking this afternoon, so if you'd bear with me while I read the notes that I scribbled down ——

Senator JEFFORDS. You go right ahead.

Sue Mahoney. —we will be all set. We have not heard too much about the Drug-Free Schools and Communities program today, but it is also part of the ESEA. And these moneys have played a critical role in schools' prevention efforts here in Vermont. And I would like to address three main concerns that I have.

As many of those who have come before me today, I too want to urge you to continue the small State minimums. In the Drug-Free Schools program we often hear what I hope are rumors about tak-

ing money away from the small rural states who don't really have a problem and using it to focus on the real drug problems in the inner cities. Well, we do have a drug problem here in Vermont, and our drug of choice, as you probably know, is alcohol. And at a time when the alcohol industry has the ability to pour billions of dollars into television advertising primarily viewed by the young people that we are trying to serve in schools, we need every penny that we can get to mount our counterattack.

My second point is more of a question. I am wondering if in the reauthorization there could be some provision for some education of the U.S. Department of Education staff members who work with the Drug-Free Schools program around alcohol and drug abuse issues. These people are good people. They are primarily bureaucrats who've had little or no background around alcohol and other drug issues, and because of this their view of how these funds can be used are somewhat limited and narrow. They really don't know a lot about the proscription techniques that are available and, therefore, they are looking at having states do programs that give out a lot of information about alcohol and other drug abuse and they don't recognize that some good primary prevention programs don't necessarily talk about alcohol and drug abuse but really are about creating conditions that will make people to not use those choices. So when we at the states have—at conferences and that have talked to the people at the U.S. Department of Education they kind of indicate that there is no money allowed for training for their staff. And so my question is, is there any way to include that as part of the conditions?

And the third point is really that the Federal vision of what these funds can do is somewhat narrow. It is focused on providing students with information and primarily providing intervention services. And while these services are very important, we in Vermont prefer to focus more on prevention services. And prevention is defined as making good things happen so bad things won't. And in a lot of our schools Drug-Free Schools money has been used just for these things. And these programs, as I said, don't always directly focus on alcohol and drug issues but more on the root causes. Schools need to have the flexibility in this funding to use these moneys for programs that will develop children who become competent, caring individuals who have the skills to make healthier choices not to use alcohol and other drugs. Thank you.

Senator JEFFORDS. Thank you very much. Thank you all for being a very patient audience out here. I want a report from you all of what you have heard—no, but I do appreciate deeply your attendance and listening. I also want to thank very sincerely Katherine Malley here who has been most loyal and helpful and got the word down. And my staff also, Pam Devitt, who is my senior person on my education committee staff, along with Katie Henry, who's the expert on the ESEA and help them keep this as efficient and effective as it was. And I want to most importantly thank all of the witnesses who have brought to me some very excellent testimony which I will use in guiding my direction to others in the Senate on what we need to do to improve not just the Elementary and Secondary Education Act but also to look toward the future and try

to ensure that we do more at the national level to help those that are laboring so hard at the State and local levels.

So thank you all, and with that I will officially close the hearing.

[Whereupon, at 3:15 p.m. the Committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]